

## SECRÉTARIAT DE LA REVUE DE QUMRÂN

Dans une note au caractère 'quasi-prophétique', Jean Carmignac, le fondateur de la *Revue de Qumrân* qui en assurait la direction générale et le secrétariat, écrivait, trois mois avant de nous quitter : « La sagesse demande que la *Revue de Qumrân* soit confiée à des mains plus jeunes et plus dégagées » (*RQ* 12/47 [1986] 325).

Depuis 1975, Carmignac dont j'avais suivi les cours dans les années 1967-70, m'avait demandé d'être son collaborateur et directeur-adjoint de la *Revue* ; mon premier acte fut le passage des Éditions Letouzey et Ané dont le directeur littéraire venait de prendre sa retraite, aux Éditions Gabalda avec le numéro 33 paru en janvier 1977. Mais comme je résidais à Jérusalem pour l'édition des manuscrits du lot Starcky, il tenait, par souci d'efficacité, à ce que le secrétariat reste à Paris ou soit établi au moins en Europe. Ainsi il accepta ma proposition de demander à mon ami et collègue, Florentino García Martínez alors en poste à Groningen, de se charger des tables à partir du tome 10 (1981) et de la bibliographie dès le numéro 41 (1982). Ce dernier en a été relevé pour la bibliographie par *Orion Center* avec le numéro 73 (1999) et pour les tables par Corrado Martone avec le tome 19 (2000), comme secrétaire-adjoint. Dans le numéro 47 (1986) 325-26, Carmignac passait définitivement la main au nouveau directeur et confiait la charge du secrétariat à Florentino García Martínez.

Dès que possible, Florentino García Martínez et moi-même avons tenu à une périodicité de deux fascicules annuels, afin d'assurer une parution enfin régulière de la *Revue*. Le travail de Florentino García Martínez comme secrétaire de la *Revue de Qumrân* a été très efficace et exemplaire à plus d'un titre. Aussi au moment où il a décidé de mettre un terme à cette tâche combien importante pour tous, je veux l'en remercier très chaleureusement en mon nom, au nom des Éditions Gabalda et au nom des auteurs collaborateurs et des lecteurs de la *Revue de Qumrân*. Cela a été un réel plaisir de travailler avec un tel

collègue et ami de longue date. Par ses multiples compétences et son infatigable énergie, sa contribution a été des plus précieuses au long de ces trente années d'implication et des vingt-cinq ans de collaboration. Les nombreux contributeurs des cinquante numéros préparés par Florentino García Martínez le savent pertinemment. Il a mené de front bien d'autres tâches de direction et il est juste qu'il veuille ménager ses énergies pour d'autres projets. Nous lui souhaitons de longues années de travail fructueux et nous serons toujours heureux d'accueillir ses suggestions comme membre du conseil académique de la *Revue de Qumrân*.

Mettant fin à sa collaboration comme secrétaire de la *Revue de Qumrân* avec le numéro 96 (2010), il cédera la charge du secrétariat à son adjoint, Corrado Martone de l'Université de Turin qui a accepté bien volontiers d'en assurer l'entière responsabilité à partir du numéro 97 (2011). Il faudra s'adresser à lui pour tout ce qui relève des tâches de secrétariat de la *Revue*. Nous souhaitons au nouveau secrétaire l'énergie nécessaire pour prendre la relève et nous redisons notre profonde reconnaissance à celui qui a tant servi la *Revue* pour notre bénéfice. Nous espérons que les collaborateurs, auteurs et lecteurs prendront soin d'assurer un avenir à la *Revue de Qumrân* et qu'ils continueront à lui réserver une audience largement reconnue dans la recherche qumranienne et bien au-delà.

Émile PUECH

Directeur de la *Revue de Qumrân*

Jérusalem, le 01-06-2010

# THE INITIAL NARRATIVE OF THE *VISIONS OF AMRAM* AND ITS LITERARY CHARACTERISTICS

## *Summary*

Since the preliminary publication of the first Aramaic fragments of the *Visions of Amram*, scholars have considered this priestly composition as having a testamentary form. Such a conclusion has been mostly based on the purported literary identity between the introductory narrative of the *Visions* and the introductory sections of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The present study first presents the arguments of previous scholars concerning the topic, then an analysis of the form and content of the initial narrative of the *Visions* is undertaken, finally a comparison between the Aramaic text and the Greek *Testaments* illustrates the process of literary development detectable in the latter work. The comparison of the two texts makes it clear that from the point of view of literary criticism it is not justifiable to see a literary identity between the two compositions, and the historical process of genre transformation has to be duly recognized and described.

## 1. The *Visions of Amram* and the Testamentary Genre

IN 1956 Jean Starcky informed the scholarly world about the existence at Qumran of three copies of an Aramaic pseudepigraphic work similar to the *Testament of Levi*. (1) In 1972 Józef T. Milik published some parts of the Aramaic text, including the reconstructed

(1) Starcky 1956: 66: "Un apocryphe analogue au *Testament de Levi* est représenté par trois manuscrits au moins." Citing Starcky's opinion, Paul. J. Kobelski (1981: 24) arrives at the conclusion that the work dedicated to Amram should be classified as a testament: "Indeed, the content of the introductory passage of 4Q<sup>a</sup>Amram, which can be compositely read from fragments of MSS a, c, and d, indicates that the work is in the same literary category as the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*, and is in fact the *Testament of 'Amram*." Following Milik, Kobelski bases his opinion concerning the literary genre of the *Visions* on the content of the introductory passage, and does not adduce any argument concerning the literary form or structure of the Aramaic text.

initial part of the fragmentary composition. In his article, Milik (1972: 77) followed the title of the Aramaic composition found in the manuscripts, and began calling it “le livre des Visions de ‘Amram’ ou bien ‘les Visions de ‘Amram.’” He, however, added that the alternative title that can be used for this composition is “‘le Testament de ‘Amram,’ ce qui rattache le contenu de cette oeuvre importante à un genre littéraire bien connu.” Thus, while Starcky saw an analogy between the *Visions of Amram* and the *Testament of Levi*, Milik went further in suggesting that the content of the Aramaic pseudepigraphon that describes the life of Amram is related to the literary genre of a testament. At the end of the article Milik published a short Aramaic fragment from Qumran, 4Q542 1 ii 9–12, (2) that he called the “Testament of Qahat,” and argued that there existed three testaments about the priestly patriarchs, (Levi, Qahat, and Amram) composed in Aramaic, then translated into Greek, and finally proclaimed as βιβλία ἀπόκρυφα by the *Apostolic Constitutions* VI, §16.3a. The apocryphal Aramaic texts dedicated to Qahat (4Q542) and Amram (4Q543–549) were eventually published by Émile Puech (2001: 257–282, 283–405) in the *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert* series. Following Milik, Puech classified the two Aramaic works as belonging to the literary genre of a testament, although he did not compare their literary form with that of the Greek *Testaments*. He is also convinced that the *Visions of Amram* were composed not later than the first half of the second century B.C., although an earlier date in the third or even fourth century B.C. cannot be excluded.

One of the reasons which led Milik to classify the *Visions of Amram* as a testament stems from his conviction that the *Visions* are related to the Aramaic *Testament of Levi* known from the Cairo Geniza and Qumran caves 1 and 4. Since the publication of the first leaf of this Levitical work from the Cairo Geniza (Pass and Arendzen 1900), scholars pointed to the evident overlapping of the longer Aramaic text with the Greek *Testament of Levi* that makes part of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. This is why the Aramaic text dedicated to Levi was considered as a literary source of the Greek *Testament* and began to be called Aramaic *Testament of Levi*. Initially the research concentrated on the textual relationship between the Greek and Aramaic text, (3) but eventually in a passing remark Burchard (1965: 283, n. 2) questioned the assumption that the literary

(2) The problem of the literary genre of the *Admonitions of Qahat* and its relationship to the testamentary literature has been discussed in Drawnel 2006b.

(3) For the comprehensive history of interpretation concerning the Levitical text, see Drawnel 2004: 4–11.

form of the Aramaic fragments corresponds to the literary form of the Greek *Testament of Levi*. This first observation, however, did not lead to the comprehensive analysis of the literary features of the Aramaic composition dedicated to Levi. (4) On the other hand, scholars acquainted with the Greek *Testaments* and the Aramaic text formulated the general opinion that the Aramaic work is not a testament, although it contains testamentary features that later appear in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. When the Qumran fragments of the Aramaic *Testament of Levi* began to be published, Greenfield and Stone (1990) started calling the whole composition “Aramaic Levi Document,” while Robert Kugler (1996) opted for a shorter form: “Aramaic Levi.” In this way, the noun “testament” disappeared from the scholarly terminology, but the analysis of the literary features inherent in the Aramaic text was still lacking.

In his monograph concerning the testament as a literary form in the Hellenistic and Roman periods Eckhard von Nordheim (1980: 229–242) builds his definition of the testamentary genre mainly on the basis of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarch*, with a recourse to later testaments like the *Testament of Job*, *Testament of Adam*, etc. In a general presentation of the genre (5) he argues that, according to the stylistic criteria, the testament can be divided into three parts: the introductory narrative (*Anfangsrahmen*), the central section (*Mittelteil*), and the concluding narrative (*Schlußrahmen*). The introductory narrative is composed of the following elements: title of the work, and the name of the fictitious author, the addressees who are recipients of the speech, indication of the imminent death of the speaker narrated in the first or third person singular, age of the speaker and comparative chronology, circumstances of the incoming speech of the patriarch, introductory formula of the speech. (6) The central section mainly consists of the speech of the dying person to his children, family, friends, or people in general. The speech contains three formal elements: review of the past life (*Rückblick auf die Vergangenheit*), instructions concerning the correct behavior (*Verhaltensan-*

(4) For an overview of the history of scholarship concerning the literary features of the Aramaic composition, see Drawnel 2004: 85–87.

(5) See von Nordheim 1980: 229–232.

(6) See von Nordheim’s (1980: 229) elements of the *Anfangsrahmen* of a testament: “In einem *Anfangsrahmen* finden sich in der Regel der *Titel* der Schrift und der *Name* ihres (fiktiven) Verfassers, die Nennung der *Adressaten*, die angesprochen werden, ein *Hinweis auf den bevorstehenden Tod* des Redenden in *berichtender und/oder persönlich erzählender Form*, eine *Altersangabe*, die mitunter durch eine *Vergleichsdatierung* ergänzt wird, die Beschreibung der *Situation*, d. h. der näheren Umstände, unter denen die Rede des sterbenden Patriarchen ergeht, und schließlich eine *Rede-einleitungsformel*.

*weisungen*), and predictions for the future (*Zukunftsansage*). The concluding narrative should contain the formula concluding the speech (*Redeabschlußformel*), instructions concerning the funeral (*Bestattungsanweisungen*), information about the death of the speaker, and a short note about his burial by his sons. Von Nordheim stresses that not all the stylistic elements have to appear in each testament, but the information about the death of the speaker, his speech, and his death are constitutive elements of the genre. He also notes that the testamentary genre can serve as a literary framework (*Rahmengattung*) for other literary forms that are frequently incorporated into its structure, such as wisdom speech, covenant formula, vision, dream, hymn, etc.

Von Nordheim (1980: 232–237) also lists three additional criteria inherent in the testamentary genre, but distinct from the stylistic elements. The first one deals with the goal of the composition that the author intended to achieve while writing for his audience. The introduction to the speech and final commendations at its end suggest that the author intends to influence his readers in order to instill in them the correct behavior. The second inherent criterion consists in the didactic character of the argumentation that appears in the instructions concerning the correct behavior, in the *vaticinia ex eventu* sections, and in the fictitious situation created by the author in which a patriarch from a distant past speaks to the readers in their present situation. The third inherent criterion for the discernment of the testament as a literary genre is its motivation in transmitting the treasure of the patriarch's life experience to the reader in order to help him live his own life in a proper manner. Concerning the function of the death in the testamentary genre von Nordheim (1980: 237–239) claims that the approaching death is the best and last occasion for the patriarch to review and present the whole life experience to his descendants in order to make them follow in their life the example of the famous forefather and to stress the importance of his instruction. The setting in life for this literary genre is to be sought in Jewish wisdom circles. (7) Concerning the Greek term *διαθήκη*, von Nordheim notes that it is not advisable to use this term in relation to the history of the genre, and one should not link the term with the literary form of the testament, because the term does not appear in every text considered as a testament, the testamentary form can make part of a larger literary unit, and the Greek term itself belongs to the juridical language where it denotes a testament understood as the last disposition concerning one's property. In this legal sense the term is not present in the literary genre, and its presence there does not characterize the whole form as legal.

(7) See Nordheim 1980: 239–242.

When analyzing the introductory section of Amram's composition published by Milik, von Nordheim (1980: 117) noted the similarity between the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and, as he called it, the *Testament of Amram*. He pointed to the opening term פִּרְשָׁן that reappears in the Greek *Testaments* as ἀντίγραφον. Additionally, similarly to the Greek *Testaments*, the introductory section (*Anfangsrahmen*) in the *Visions* is composed of a general title (*Überschrift*) and a narrative section in which Amram describes for his sons the circumstances in which he receives his vision. The other elements of the introductory section of the *Visions* (addressees of the speech, indication of the coming death, patriarch's age, synchronization with the sojourn in Egypt) also find their counterpart in the *Testaments'* introductory section. Although the introductory section in the *Visions* indicates the content of the whole central part of the work (*Mittelteil*) as a visionary experience (חִזְיוֹן), it acquires the function of admonitions (*Ermahnungen*) or rather instructions concerning the conduct of Amram's sons (*Verhaltensanweisungen*) expressed by the verb פָּקֵד. On the other hand, the reference to Amram's visionary experience in the introductory section of the Aramaic text is not found in the introductory sections of the *Testaments* that do not refer to the whole content of the composition as to a visionary material. Additionally, the chronological reference in the introductory section of the *Visions* is Amram's sojourn in Egypt, while the *Testaments* usually synchronize the length of the patriarch's life with Joseph's age at his death. Nonetheless, the similarity between the introductory section of the *Visions* and the *Testaments'* introductory narrative allows the conclusion that the two works not only belong to the same literary genre, but also a direct literary contact must be assumed. (8)

When discussing the phenomenon of Jewish testamentary literature, John J. Collins (1984: 326) mentions 4Q *Visions of Amram* from Qumran, but is hesitant as to its classification as a testament. He affirms that, although the conclusion of the work is missing, the introductory narrative does not conform to the usual format of a testament because it contains a summary heading rather than a direct narrative. He notes that the content of the work deals with the vision of the demonic Melchiresha and his angelic counterpart, presumably Melchizedek. Concluding his brief remarks, Collins states that "in so far as the words of Amram constitute a vision report they are signifi-

(8) von Nordheim 1980: 117: "Davon abgesehen ist jedoch die Ähnlichkeit zwischen den Anfangsrahmen der TestXIIPatr. und dem des Test'Amram so auffallend und im Vergleich mit den anderen Testamenten so singulär, daß sie die bloße Entsprechung innerhalb der gleichen Gattung deutlich übersteigt. Diese Ähnlichkeit kann nur auf direkter literarischen Bekanntschaft beruhen."

cantly different from the *Test. 12 Patr.*, *Test. Moses* or *Test. Job* (although vision reports are found as a subordinate element in *Test. Levi*, *Test. Naphtali* and *Test. Jos.*).”

In my doctoral dissertation (Drawnel 2004) I published all the fragments of the so-called *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran, Cairo Geniza and Mt. Athos, and for the first time analyzed the literary units inherent in the Aramaic text. My presentation included the following literary forms found in the *Aramaic Levi Document*: narrative framework formulated in the first person singular, prayer (1a vv. 1–19), two visionary dreams (v. 1b and vv. 3a–7), rewritten Bible (vv. 1c–3), wisdom instruction (vv. 11–50; 51–61), genealogy with onomastic midrashim (vv. 62–77), autobiographical section (78–81), didactic poem (82–98), prophetic speech with apocalyptic overtones (99–104). (9) I also pointed out that Akkadian literature knows the literary genre of a fictional autobiography that can end with a blessing/curse, didactic or prophetic endings; the story of Levi’s life narrated in the first person singular narrative voice seems to be related to this kind of literary genre. (10) I indicated the didactic context for the Levi document, *Visions of Amram* and *Admonitions of Qahat* (4Q542), (11) and pointed out that simple arithmetical calculations of Babylonian origin found in the Levi document (vv. 31–47) indicate the actual context of knowledge transmission. Since the *Aramaic Astronomical Book* from Qumran also contains simple arithmetical calculations based on Babylonian astrological tradition, I proposed to read and interpret these four Aramaic works together as an example of school literature that stems from the social context of the Levitical family. My subsequent research proved that the *Aramaic Astronomical Book* is indeed related to the Levitical didactic tradition found in the Aramaic compositions dedicated to the three priestly patriarchs. (12) Hence in my research I began to refer to the so-called *Aramaic Levi Document* with a different appellation (*Visions of Levi*) in order to stress the literary and thematic relationship with the *Visions of Amram* and the *Admonitions of Qahat*.

In his recent contribution Jörg Frey (2009) (13) analyzes the farewell discourses in the Qumran library in order to look for the origins

(9) For the analysis of each literary form, see Form and Structure sections in chapter 3 of Drawnel 2004.

(10) See Drawnel 2004: 89–96.

(11) For the analysis of the literary features of the *Admonitions of Qahat*, see Drawnel 2006b.

(12) See Drawnel 2006a.

(13) The author of this study expresses his gratitude to Jörg Frey who kindly allowed him to read the article before its publication.



of the genre of the “literary testament.” He claims that in the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* “the testamentary character is made explicit by the keyword διαθήκη as used in the titles and the beginnings of the texts as a technical term for the genre of a literary farewell discourse” (§1). Concerning the criteria that constitute the literary genre of a testament, he subscribes to von Nordheim’s three-fold division, and stresses, also with von Nordheim, that the following elements are necessary to consider a writing a testament: the (announcement of the) death of the speaker’s speech (or writing) related to the imminent death/instructions for the addressees who stay back (§2). He notes that von Nordheim’s definitions are strongly influenced by the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, nevertheless he uses these criteria in describing the literary features of some Qumran compositions considered in previous research as testaments. When analyzing the beginning of the *Visions of Amram* (§3.6), although the word “testament” is not present there, he recognizes the testamentary formal features of the introductory narrative and of the rest of the composition as well. According to Frey, the following elements classify the introductory section of the *Visions of Amram* as a testament: “a) There is the *name of the fictive author or speaker* and the *title of the work* – with the only difference that it is not explicitly called ‘testament’ but ‘vision,’ but even the term ‘copy’ (פרשנן) is used, which corresponds to the characteristic technical term ἀπογραφὴ in the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. b) There is mention of the addressees, the son Aaron and his brothers, the sons of Amram. c) The imminent death of Amram is mentioned. d) The age of Amram is given, together with a comparative date, related to the sojourn of Israel in Egypt. e) The situation is given: the gathering happens after Amram had given his daughter in marriage, and after the wedding feast. f) The content of the book is also given in the framework: “all that he told his sons and all that he commanded (פקד) them”. Thus, the whole of the work is characterized as an instruction, a collection of commandments to his sons, i.e. as a ‘testamentary’ text.”

The review of the opinions concerning the literary form of the *Visions of Amram* has shown that the testamentary character of the Aramaic work has been accepted by some, while questioned by others. The testamentary character of the composition seems to be well detectable in the introductory narrative that constitutes the starting point of analysis in von Nordheim’s and Frey’s research. Hence, it seems advisable to concentrate on the well-preserved text of the Aramaic narrative in order to find some indications that might help in establishing its literary characteristics. Once the literary analysis accompanied by the notes on the content of the narrative is done, the

comparison with the opening verses of the Greek *Testaments* should throw more light on the literary relationship between the two compositions.

## 2. The Literary Structure of the Introductory Narrative of the *Visions of Amram*

Émile Puech (2001: 292) reconstructed the first ten lines of column I of the fragmentary 4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c, supplemented by 4Q545 frg. 1a i and 4Q546 frg. 1. The fragmentary manuscripts of the *Visions of Amram* preserved the whole introductory narrative of the Aramaic composition and the first two lines of Amram's speech in the first person singular that begins in line 9b. The fragmentary text in 4Q545 frg. 1a i 9–19 supplemented by 4Q543 frg. 2 a–b indicates that Amram orders Aaron to call Malakiyah, and Amram's speech begins with the description of the glorious future of Moses called by his Hebrew name. (14) The context, however, is fragmentary, and the recipient of the speech is not expressly mentioned in the preserved text.

The whole composition begins with a summary heading that presents the content of the whole work, and sets the length of Amram's life within the chronological frame of the Egyptian exile. The summary heading starts with the first opening words in line 1 ("copy of the writing"), and ends with the synchronization of the year of Amram's death with the chronology of the sojourn in Egypt in line 4a. Once the presentation of the main hero of the whole text is over, the following narrative deals with the marriage of Uzziel, Amram's youngest brother with Mariam, (15) his daughter (4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c, lines 4b–7a). The section begins with the particle אף introduced by the conjunction *waw* in line 4b, and ends in line 7a with the expression „and he rejoiced" (והדי). The third part of the initial narrative focuses on Amram's son, Aaron, called to the presence of his father. This short section begins in line 7b with the syntactic marker אדן and the temporal clause introduced by כדי. Finally, the expression ואמר לה in 4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c, line 9a introduces Amram's speech and marks the end of the whole introductory narrative. Thus the first part of the composition is structured into three distinct sections, and only the first one refers to the whole work. It should also be noted that the second and third sections do not contain any indication that Uzziel's wedding

(14) Robert Duke (2007) corrected Puech's understanding of מלאכיה, and showed the connection of the Aramaic lexeme with Moses in later Jewish literature.

(15) For this vocalisation of Amram's daughter name, see LXX *Exod* 6:20; 15:20, 21; *Num* 12:1, 4, 5, 10, etc.

and Amram's speech take place on the last day of Amram's life, and a deathbed gathering is also absent. The indication of the day and year of Amram's death suggests that the temporal framework for the whole composition is introduced, without any additional information about the deathbed gathering.

Table 1.

4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c, 1–9a Supplemented by 4Q545 frg. 1a i 1–9 (16)

### I. Summary Heading (lines 1–4a)

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| (1) פרשנן כתב מלי חזות עמרם בר קהת בר לוי      | A. |
| כול די (2) אחוי לבנוהי ודי פקד אנן ביום מותה   | B. |
| בשנת מאה (3) ותלתן ושת היא שנתא די מותה        | C. |
| בשנת מאה (4a) וחמשין ותרתין לגלות ישראל למצרין | D. |

### II. Wedding of Uzziel and Mariam (lines 4b–7a)

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| (4b) ואף עבר (5) עלוהי ושלח וקרא לעזיאל אחוהי ועזרא | E. |
| ואסב (6) לה למרים ברתה לאנתה ברת תלת' שני           | F. |
| ועבד משתותה (7a) שבעה יומין ואכל ואשתי במשתותה וחד  | G. |

### III. Summoning of Aaron (lines 7b–9a)

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| (7b) אדן (8) כדי אשתצין יומי משתותא       | H. |
| שלח קרא לאהרון (9a) לברה כמה בר שני עשרין | I. |
| ואמר לה                                   | J. |

Translation:

### I. Summary Heading (lines 1–4a)

- A. (1) Copy of the writing of the 'words of the vision(s) of Amram,' son of Qahat, son of Levi,  
 B. all that (2) he showed his sons and that commanded them on the day of his death,  
 C. in the year one hundred (3) thirty-six, that is the year of his death,  
 D. in the year one hundred (4a) fifty-two of the exile of Israel to Egypt.

### II. Wedding of Uzziel and Mariam (lines 4b–7a)

- E. (4b) And also it crossed (5) his mind to send and call Uzziel, his youngest brother,  
 F. and he made him marry (6) Mariam, his daughter, when she was thirty years old.  
 G. And he celebrated his wedding (7a) for seven days, ate, drank during his wedding, and rejoiced.

(16) The numbers in parentheses indicate the line disposition of 4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c as reconstructed by Puech (2001: 292). 4Q546 frg. 1 1–2 overlaps with 4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c lines 2 and 4, and with 4Q545 frg. 1a i 3–4, but it does not add any new text in comparison with 4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c, 1–4 and 4Q545 frg. 1a i 1–4, see Puech 2001: 353–354. Brackets and reconstruction signs have been removed for reasons of clarity. The reader can consult Puech's edition of the text for text-critical purposes.

### III. Summoning of Aaron (lines 7b–9a)

- H. (7b) Then (8) when the days of the wedding had been completed,
- I. he sent for Aaron (9a) his son who was around twenty years old.
- J. And he said to him:

### 3. The Summary Heading of the *Visions of Amram*

The summary heading (lines 1–4a) of the whole work is composed of four lines of almost equal length. It is divided into two parts: the first two lines (A and B) constitute a unit in which the two clauses in the second line comment on the first line, that is, they additionally explain the content of the whole work. The next two lines of the introduction (C and D) contain two chronological formulas that indicate with precision the date when Amram pronounces his teachings: the year of his death and the year of the Egyptian exile. The connection with the precedent two lines is assured by the chronological expression at the end of line B: “on the day of his death.”

The second section of the initial narrative (II. E–G) describes the wedding of Mariam and Uzziel, in the arrangement of which the priestly patriarch takes an active part. This short story at the beginning of the whole composition stresses the genealogical and biographical interest of the Aramaic author, and at the same time it formulates the principle of endogamic marriage followed by the priestly patriarchs. In the *Visions of Levi* Levi himself is obedient to Isaac’s instruction to marry a woman from Isaac’s family (v. 17) and marries Melcha, a daughter of Bathuel, son of Laban (v. 62). His sons and grandsons follow the same principle (v. 73), and Amram takes Yochebed, Levi’s daughter and Amram’s aunt, as wife (v. 75). (17) The second section of the opening narrative in the *Visions of Amram* unequivocally stresses the same endogamic principle valid for Amram’s youngest brother and Mariam, Amram’s daughter. The age of Mariam and Uzziel at the moment of the wedding is given, which corresponds to the similar chronological interest of the author of the *Visions of Levi* who links the most important events in Levi’s life with the age of the priestly patriarch (VLev. 62–81).

In the third section of the initial narrative the circumstantial clause about the end of the wedding links the text with the preceding section, but the calling of Aaron (III. H–J) serves as a direct introduction to Amram’s speech. At the beginning of the speech Amram

(17) Note that these endogamic practices within the priestly family are prohibited by Lev 18:12; 20:19; cf. the rules of the *Temple Scroll* in 4Q524 15–22; 11Q19 LXVI.

orders Aaron to call Malakiyah (מלאכיה), and the first part of the speech (4Q545 frg. 1a 9–19) probably deals with the glorious future of Aaron's brother. The last clause (III. J) of the narrative introduces direct speech. The notes that follow concentrate on the analysis of the content of the summary heading. A detailed analysis of sections II and III of the introductory narrative exceeds the limits of this study, although the comparison with the Greek *Testaments* in §4 will be helpful to see the differences with the testamentary form.

*Line A.*

In a series of nouns in the bound form the author formulated the title of the composition, the name of its main hero, and his genealogy. The very first word of Persian origin (פרשן) suggests the scribal milieu of the composition. The biblical texts in which this term is used (Ezra 4:11, 235:6; Hebrew פתשן Est 3:14; 4:8; 8:13) indicate that the introduction to the copies of the official documents issued by the royal chancery in Persia began in that way. (18) The next word “writing” (כתב) unequivocally indicates that a written document is being copied, so the action of transcribing a written text is clearly implied. The reader receives the message that what he is reading is not an autograph but a copy; such a message stresses a secondary role of the scribe responsible for copying the text whose main authorship is ascribed to Amram a few words later. In a later development, the text of the *Visions* states that Amram himself wrote the vision he had (4Q547 frg. 9 8) וחזוהו כתב], which clearly indicates the author of the visionary account. Additionally, the first person singular narration present in the whole composition suggests that all the content of the work, except for its introductory narrative framework (4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c lines 1–9), comes directly from the patriarch. The patriarchal authorship of the priestly texts is also stressed by the *Admonitions of Qahat* (4Q542) in which the son of Levi exhorts his sons to take care of all his writings (4Q542 frg. 1 ii 12 כול כתבי) and to walk with them (4Q542 frg. 1 ii 13). Thus the very first words of the title point to the same scribal milieu of priestly authors responsible for the composition of the *Visions of Levi* and *Admonitions of Qahat*.

The following phrase מלי חזות עמרם constitutes the title of the whole work, and is similar to the title of many biblical and extrabiblical books, for example “words of Amos” (*Amos* 1:1) “words of Jer-

(18) I argued elsewhere that the priestly traditions expressed in the *Visions of Levi* have their origin in the Persian period and are linked with the reforms of Ezra, a Babylonian Jew and important officer in Persian administration, see Drawnel 2004: 67–71.

miah" (*Jer* 1:1), "words of Enoch" (*Jub.* 21:10), "words of Noah" (*Jub.* 21:1). (19) The stress is laid on Amram's oral utterances ("words"), so the first person singular narrative voice is hereby implied. Since the following line B of the summary heading refers to Amram's didactic function, it is necessary to stress the didactic character of Amram's utterances. The *Visions of Levi* present the words of Isaac's instruction directed to Levi from the same didactic perspective. At the end of his priestly instruction, Isaac addresses Levi in an exhortatory manner: "And now, my child, listen to my words (τοὺς λόγους μου) and hearken to my commandments (τὰς ἐντολάς μου), and let these my words (οἱ λόγοι μου) not leave your heart all your days" (*VLev.* 48). Although only the Greek translation has been preserved (MS E 18,2), one may surmise that behind the Greek ἐντολή one should expect the Aramaic noun ܢܩܪܐ (cf. *VLev.* 83b). The following Isaac's exhortation uses the related verb ἐντέλλομαι "to command" in relation to his priestly teaching (*VLev.* 49, 52) and in relation to the priestly teaching transmitted to Isaac by Abraham (*VLev.* 50, 50, 57). (20) From the semantic point of view, the Greek verb ἐντέλλομαι corresponds to the Aramaic ܢܩܪܐ. Isaac also commands Levi to transmit this professional instruction to his sons: "And command (ἐντειλον) your sons in such a way that they do according to this law

(19) For the list of references, see Steiner 1995: 66–67.

(20) Concerning the use of the term ἐντέλλομαι in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, see Drawnel 2004: 295: "The Greek term ἐντέλλομαι is an important notion in *T. 12 Patr.*, but its meaning there differs from the use of the *Document*. The Greek term in the *T. 12 Patr.* sometimes summarizes the whole Testament (*T. Reu.* 1:1, 5; 7:1; *T. Sim.* 8:1; *T. Levi* 19:4; *T. Naph.* 9:1), or introduces the last wish of the dying patriarch (*T. Ash.* 8:1; *T. Benj.* 12:1; *T. Jud.* 26:4; *T. Iss.* 7:8; *T. Ash.* 8:2; cf. *T. Naph.* 9:3). The third application of the term in the *Testaments* refers to the patriarch's moral teaching and underlines the necessity of passing it down to the next generations to assure a future for them (*T. Reu.* 4:5; 6:8; *T. Sim.* 7:3; *T. Levi* 10:1; 13:1; *T. Jud.* 13:1; 17:1; cf. *T. Reu.* 6:2). None of the *Testaments'* uses of the term apply to the context of the *Document*. Although the biblical references suggest the testamentary setting for Isaac's speech, the *Document* does not mention it at all (cf. *A.L.D.* 13). His instructions, therefore, are not his last will but constitute a teaching necessary to perform priestly and administrative functions. Levi is to command his sons not to assure a future for them but because they too are to be priests (*A.L.D.* 49); additionally, the Levitical priesthood is eternal, without limits in time (see *A.L.D.* 3b; 6; 58–60; *A.L.D.* 100). Furthermore, when Levi transmits the commandments to his sons (*A.L.D.* 82–98), he does not do it on his deathbed, a detail characteristic to testamentary literature, but in the year 118 of his life on the occasion of Joseph's death (cf. *A.L.D.* 82). The redactor(s) of the *Testament of Levi* greatly reduced Isaac's speech to a few verses (9:6–14) simply because its content and purpose did not correspond to the characteristics of the *Testaments* and their concentration on exclusively moral or ethical issues (cf. Hollander 1985: 31–32). Similarly, Isaac's order to commend the priestly precepts to Levi's children (*A.L.D.* 49–50) became Levi's general exhortation set in the context of future apostasy (*T. Levi* 10:1–5)."

as I have shown you" (*VLev.* 49). Levi follows Isaac's command when at the beginning of the wisdom poem (*VLev.* 83c) he exhorts his sons to hear his word (**מאמר**) and obey his commands (**פקודין**). It is evident that Levi's word and his commands are two synonymous terms that denote the content of his sapiential and priestly teaching transmitted to him by Isaac.

The form **חזות** without vocalization does not allow one to state unequivocally whether we deal here with a singular or plural noun. The rest of the preserved text seems to contain only one vision (*4Q543* frgs. 5–10, frg. 14; *4Q544* frgs. 1–3; *4Q545* frg. 4; *4Q546* frgs. 7–12; *4Q547* frg. 9–17; frg. 9 8–11; cf. *4Q544* frg. 1 9–10: **חזית בחזי חזוה (די חלמא**), but it is questionable whether the term **חזות** in the title exclusively refers to the content of the visions because line A refers to the whole text of the composition, not to one part of it only. Consequently, the reader cannot understand the expression "words of the vision(s) of Amram" as exclusively referring to what Amram said or heard in his vision of the two angels. The expression should be read and understood in the context of the following line B that contains an explanation of the title: "all that he showed his sons and that commanded them on the day of his death." Thus there remains no doubt that the expression "words of the vision(s)" resumes all the material that the composition comprises (narrative framework, Amram's speech; sojourn in Hebron; vision; Amram's speech to Aaron and all his descendants; descendants of Uzziel and Mariam and the marriage of Hur [?]). One should note that the book of Isaiah bears a similar title **חזון ישעיהו** (*Isa* 1:1), which does not imply that the only literary form used in the whole prophetic book is a vision, but rather the content of the book is considered as revealed (cf. *Obad* 1:1). The beginning of the book of *Nahum* (1:1) contains a Hebrew phrase that closely corresponds to the Aramaic title: **ספר חזון נחום** "the book of the vision of Nahum." The visionary revelation is paralleled with the written book in *Isa* 29:11: "And the vision of all this (**חזות הכל**) has become to you like the words of a book that is sealed (**כדברי הספר החתום**)."

The revelatory character of the whole content of the book is closely related to Amram's instructional activity in line B that additionally qualifies line A. In this didactic context one should recall the use of the root *h-z-y* in a didactic context in the *Visions of Levi* and in the *Astronomical Book*. (21) In his professional instruction Isaac "shows" (v. 15: **אחזיך**) to Levi the principles of priestly law; the same narration stresses that Isaac's priestly knowledge stems from his "seeing" (v. 22: **חזיתי**) the ritual performed by Abraham. At the end

(21) For the full discussion of the topic, see Drawnel 2006a: §2.



of the priestly instruction (*VLev.* 49) Isaac states that he has shown (ὕποδεικνυμι) the priestly law to Levi. In a fragmentary context the *Aramaic Astronomical Book* preserves some formulas of knowledge transmission where the verb ܠܝܬ in 'ap'el (4Q209 frg. 23 2) or in 'op'al (4Q209 frg. 25 3–4) is used. In the *Ethiopic Astronomical Book* the causative form (CG) of the verb rə'ya “to see” expresses Uriel’s didactic activity in relation to the recipient of astronomical knowledge who “sees” it.

Although the bulk of the preserved text in the *Visions of Levi* stresses the instructional character of the priestly office, the remnants of two visions (*VLev.* 1b; 3a–7) show that the visionary material makes an integral part of this priestly composition. Additionally, in the genealogical presentation of his sons, Levi predicts their future destiny in relation to the priestly and royal office (*VLev.* 64, 67). When he addresses them directly in his speech, Levi’s knowledge concerning their future comes from his visions (*VLev.* 98; cf. v. 64) and from his reading of the books (*VLev.* 99). The last preserved section of the Aramaic text (*VLev.* 99–104) exclusively contains Levi’s predictions concerning the future of his sons. This is perhaps the reason why the introductory section of the Greek *Testament of Levi*, while speaking about the content of the whole composition, stresses the previsions concerning the future destiny of his sons: κατὰ πάντα ἃ ποιήσουσιν καὶ ὅσα συναντήσῃ αὐτοῖς ἕως ἡμέρας κρίσεως (*T. Lev.* 1:1). The Aramaic text of the *Visions of Levi* makes it clear that these previsions stem from Levi’s visionary experience.

The last part of line A refers to Amram’s genealogical credentials, a common element in the headings of the prophetic books (cf. *Isa* 1:1; *Jer* 1:1; *Joel* 1:1; *Zeph* 1:1; *Zech* 1:1). The reference to Amram’s father, Qahat, and his grandfather, Levi, does not serve in the *Visions* to identify the genealogical descent of the speaker only, but stresses his priestly credentials. The priestly genealogy does not seem to be pointing to the biblical account in which neither Levi nor Qahat play any priestly role. The evocation of Amram’s father and grandfather should be certainly read in the context of the *Visions of Levi* in which Levi presents his sons and grandsons (*VLev.* 62–77), and emphatically stresses the priestly dignity of Qahat (*VLev.* 67, MS A and E 18,2) and Amram’s glorious future. According to Levi’s visionary prediction expressed in the form of an onomastic midrash (*VLev.* 76), Amram’s exalted position stems from his role of the one who will lead the people out of the land of Egypt. Such a statement clearly alludes to the future role of Amram’s sons, Moses and Aaron, in leading the whole Israel out from the Egyptian slavery. Levi also



speaks about the marriage of Amram with Levi's daughter and Amram's aunt, Yochebed (*VLev.* 75) that took place in the ninety-fourth year of Levi's life.

*Line B.*

This line stands in apposition to the preceding one and supplements its content. While line A presents the book and its main speaker, line B spells out its instructional character, Amram's sons as recipients of the message, and a chronological detail concerning the moment in Amram's life when the speech is being uttered. The noun כול at the beginning of the line refers to „words of the visions of Amram,” and stresses their exhaustive character. The two verbs that follow in the two relative clauses indicate the didactic character of the whole work. The 'ap'el of h-w-y and pa'el of p-q-d belong to the instructional language used by a teacher who instructs his sons/pupils in topics related to their professional education. These two verbs introduce Levi's speech in his wisdom poem in the *Visions of Levi*: “I myself command (מפקד) you, my sons, and I myself show (מהחוי) you the truth, my beloved” (*VLev.* 84; cf. v. 82). A similar form of knowledge transmission is found in the *Aramaic Astronomical Book* (4Q209 frg. 26 6): וכען מהוה אנה לך ברי “And now, I show you, my son.” Although the text is fragmentary and one does not know who is speaking, the content of the teaching deals with the calculations concerning the length of the lunar year. In the *Admonitions of Qahat* (4Q542 frg. 1 ii 9) Levi's son addresses Amram with a similar formula: וכען לכה עמרם: ברי אנה מפקדן “And now, to you, Amram, my son, I comman[d]”. In the next line (4Q542 frg. 1 ii 10) Qahat seems to instruct not only Amram, but Amram's descendants as well, and his instruction deals with the transmission of the priestly books received from the forefathers (4Q542 frg. 1 ii 10–13). When speaking to his sons, Qahat also exhorts them to follow the moral virtues transmitted to them by their fathers according to everything (ככול) that Qahat himself has commanded (פקד) and taught (אלף) them: (4Q542 frg. 1 i 13–ii 1). The parallelism of the used expression כול and the verb פקד with line B of the *Visions of Amram* is striking.

The didactic character of the *Visions of Amram* is not so evident as in the case of the *Visions of Levi*, but the preserved text is fragmentary and incomplete. Amram uses the verb פקד (4Q545 frg. 1a i 11) in his initial speech (4Q545 frg. 1a 9b–19), but the context is practically nonexistent. The angelic speech to Moses (?) in 4Q543 frg. 2a–b (cf. 4Q545 frg. 1a 14–19) foresees Moses' glorious future, and the term חכמה is used. In 4Q545 frg. 4 15–19 an angel also reveals to

Amram the future of Moses and the priestly role of Aaron. Then in 4Q546 frg. 14 Amram addresses his son (line 1 **וכען ברי**) and his sons (line 4 **וכען בני**) as well, which also suggests a didactic context. In the last line of the fragment Amram speaks about his vision (4Q546 frg. 14 5), which suggests that the content of his instruction has been revealed to him in a visionary experience. Similarly to the *Visions of Levi*, the glorious future of Aaron's son is revealed in 4Q547 frg. 9 6–7 to Amram in a visionary dream. Additionally, 4Q547 frg. 8 contains a fragmentary description of the liturgical instruction concerning the stone altar (line 3) and Levi's officiating at the altar, which constitutes a clear reference to the *Visions of Levi* where Levi offers all the sacrifices at Bethel (VLev. 9–10) and is instructed by Isaac in the holocaust and meal offering (VLev. 19–47). In a visionary dream Amram is instructed to sacrifice the cattle on the bronze altar.

The last expression in line B **ביום מותה** does not constitute the crucial element of the literary structure, nor does it belong to the title of the whole composition expressed in line A. It contains a chronological detail concerning the day when Amram instructs his sons, and does not serve to introduce the deathbed scenario, which is absent in the whole introductory narrative in 4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 1–9. It rather introduces the following temporal phrases that give additional information concerning the year when Amram died (line C) and synchronize the year of Amram's death with the Egyptian exile (line D). Both the temporal expression **ביום מותה** at the end of line B and the temporal expressions at the beginning of lines C (**בשנת**) and D (**בשנת**) begin with the same preposition **ב** that in all three cases has a temporal meaning. Therefore, it becomes evident that the chronological details locate Amram's visionary speech at the end of his life (line B and C), but line D stresses the context of Israel's exile in Egypt. Although the day of Amram's death is mentioned at the end of line B, the following narrative that speaks about Uzziel's wedding (4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 4b–7a) and Amram's calling of Aaron (4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 7b–9a) does not present the patriarch as ailing or close to death.

The remaining fragments of the *Visions of Amram* (4Q543–4Q547) do not preserve the description of Amram's death or burial, but it is not certain that there must have been one. The case of the *Visions of Levi* shows that Levi mentions his death and the age at the moment of his death (VLev. 81), which suggests that he speaks from beyond the grave. The redactors of the Greek *Testament of Levi* moved the account about Levi's death and the number of his years to the end of the whole composition in *T. Lev.* 19:4, and changed the discourse from the first to the third person singular. This redactional move proves that they were molding the Aramaic text to the testamentary

form they were building on the basis of a non-testamentary composition.

*Line C.*

In a short genealogical remark, the Masoretic text in *Exod* 6:20 tells the reader that Amram died when he was one hundred thirty-seven years old, his age at his death, therefore, corresponds to that of Levi cited by *Exod* 16:6 and *VLev.* 81. But according to the Aramaic text, Amram dies when he is one hundred thirty-six years old, which agrees with the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint text of the Alexandrinus codex and four groups (*b, d, t, x*) of the LXX minuscules. The reference to the year of Amram's death in the second part of the line (היא שנתא די מותה) links this chronological detail to the day of his death mentioned at the end of line B, but the chronological perspective is enlarged to the whole year of Amram's death, which is more in consonance with the rest of the introductory narrative (4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 4b–9a) that does not suggest the immediacy of Amram's death.

The indication of the length of Amram's life is related to the *Visions of Levi* where the patriarchal genealogical and autobiographical remarks (*VLev.* 62–81) contain the chronological details concerning the year of the patriarch's life at the moment of a given event. The section closes with the year of Levi's death. A similar chronological approach seems to be present in the narrative about Amram's life when he cannot return to Egypt and has to stay in Canaan for forty-one years (4Q544 frg. 1 6). Additionally, the chronological details concerning the age of Mariam accompany the narration about Uzziel's wedding in 4Q545 frg. 1a i 6. Finally, when Amram sends for Aaron, the text also states that Aaron was about twenty years old (4Q543 frg. 1a i 9).

*Line D.*

The sojourn of Jacob's family in Egypt is called "exile" (גלות), an expression which seems to rely on the interpretation of *Gen* 15:13 where God foretells Abraham the future of his descendants: "Know of a surety that your descendants will be sojourners in a land that is not theirs, and will be slaves there, and they will be oppressed for four hundred years." Although the land of oppression is not named, the next verse mentions God's judgment against the oppressing nation and great possessions of Israel at leaving the inhospitable land, which rather unequivocally points to Egypt (cf. *Exod* 3:21–22; 12:35–36).

The arrival of Jacob's family in Egypt has become for the author of the *Visions of Amram* a chronological caesura synchronized with

the length of Amram's life. A similar chronological procedure is found in *VLev.* 80 where Levi states that he was forty-eight years old when he was brought to Egypt where he stayed for eighty-nine years. The stay of Jacob's family in Egypt appears as a chronological caesura in *Exod* 12:40 according to the Septuagint version: "The time that Israel's sons and their fathers dwelt in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan was four hundred and thirty years." The Samaritan Pentateuch preserves the chronological word order and reads "in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt," but the sentence is otherwise identical. The Masoretic text, however, contains neither the expression "and their fathers" nor "in the land of Canaan," which makes the number of years refer exclusively to the stay of Israel in Egypt. (22) By mentioning Israel's sons and their fathers the textual tradition preserved in the Septuagint and in the Samaritan Pentateuch divides the 430 years between the patriarchal era ("their fathers") and the period spent by Jacob's sons in Egypt. Thus one can infer that the four hundred thirty years refer to the period that extends from Abraham's arrival to Canaan to the exodus from Egypt. The arrival in Egypt is a dividing point of the whole period, similarly to the *Visions of Amram* where Amram's death is synchronized with the year counted from the beginning of the Egyptian exile. When one calculates the age of the priestly patriarchs beginning with the year of their arrival to Egypt, the resulting year of the exodus is 215, exactly the half of 430. Thus when one takes into account the data of *Exod* 12:40 (LXX and Sam.), the first patriarchal period counting from Abraham's arrival in Canaan to Jacob's descent to Egypt also comprises 215 years. (23) The number of four hundred years of sojourn and servitude in Egypt mentioned in *Gen* 15:13 does not concord with the chronology of *Exod* 12:40 and with the priestly chronology found in the pseudepigraphic literature under consideration. (24)

The synchronization of the year of Amram's death with the arrival of Jacob's family in Egypt indicates that Amram was born sixteen

(22) For problems concerning the textual criticism of this verse, see Grelot 1971: 384–385; Propp 1998: 365.

(23) Such a tradition is attested by Demetrius: "From the time Abraham was chosen from among the nations and migrated to Canaan, they dwelt in the land of Canaan as follows: Abraham – twenty five years; Isaac – sixty years; Jacob – 130 years; in all 215 years were spent in the land of Canaan" (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.21.16; text and transl. by Holladay 1983: 70–71). Josephus (*Ant.* § 2.318) probably follows Demetrius when he states that the exodus took place 430 years after Abraham's arrival in Canaan, and 215 years after Jacob's migration to Egypt. For echoes of this chronology in rabbinic writings, see Feldman 2000: 224, n. 849.

(24) For speculative solutions concerning *Exod* 12:40 and *Gen* 15:13, see Propp 1998: 415–416.

years after that event. This chronology properly corresponds to the chronology of Levi's life presented in the *Visions of Levi* according to which Levi is forty-eight years old when he arrives in Egypt (*VLev.* 80). Yochebed, Levi's daughter and Amram's future wife, is born on the first day of the seventh month in the year 64 of Levi's life (*VLev.* 72), that is sixteen years after Levi's arrival in Egypt. The *Visions of Levi* gives an additional information about the birth of Amram, when Levi states that Amram and Yochebed were born on the same day (*VLev.* 77), which means that also Amram was born sixteen years after Levi's arrival in Egypt. Since Qahat, Amram's father, was born in the year 34 of Levi's life (*VLev.* 68), that is fourteen years before the entry into Egypt, he was thirty years old when he fathered Amram. According to *VLev.* 75 Amram and Yochebed are married in the 94th year of Levi's life, hence their wedding occurs 46 years after the arrival of Jacob's family in Egypt, that is when they both are thirty years old. At the moment of her marriage with Uzziel Mariam is thirty years old (*4Q543* frg. 1a, b, c 6; *4Q545* frg. 1a 6), while Aaron is around twenty (*4Q543* frg. 1a, b, c 9). Following the apocryphon's chronology, Amram fathered Mariam when he was one hundred six years old, and Aaron in the one hundred sixteenth year of his life. Since *Exod* 7:7 affirms that Aaron was three years older than Moses, consequently Moses's birth should occur in the year 119 of Amram's life.

Table 2.  
Priestly Chronology and the Egyptian Exile

Event	Priestly Chronology	Egyptian Exile	Reference
Levi's Arrival in Egypt	48th year of Levi's life	1	<i>VLev.</i> 80
Yochebed's Birth	64th year of Levi's life	16	<i>VLev.</i> 72
Amram's Birth	64th year of Levi's life	16	<i>VLev.</i> 77
Marriage of Yochebed and Amram	94th year of Levi's life	46	<i>VLev.</i> 75
Levi's Death	137th year of Levi's life	89	<i>VLev.</i> 80–81
Birth of Mariam	106th year of Amram and Yochebed	122	<i>4Q543</i> frg. 1a, b, c 6; <i>4Q545</i> frg. 1a 6
Birth of Aaron	116th year of Amram and Yochebed	132	<i>4Q543</i> frg. 1a, b, c 9
Birth of Moses	119th year of Amram and Yochebed	135	<i>Exod</i> 7:7; cf. <i>Exod</i> 6:20

Event	Priestly Chronology	Egyptian Exile	Reference
Wedding of Uzziel and Mariam	136th year of Amram	152	4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 4b–7a; 4Q545 frg. 1a 4b–7a
Amram's Death	136th year of Amram	152	4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 3–4; 4Q545 frg. 1a 3–4; Exod 6:20 (LXX and Sam.)
Exodus from Egypt	80th year of Moses, 83rd year of Aaron	215	Exod 7:7 (P)

These chronological details mostly retrieved from the *Visions of Levi* and *Visions of Amram* easily synchronize with the total length of the patriarchal age in *Exod* 12:40 according to the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint. However, the birth of Amram's children would occur in the extremely old age of the patriarch and that of his wife. Hence Pierre Grelot (1971: 390–392) proposed to read the chronological data of the *Visions of Amram* as a modification of an earlier tradition, different from *Exod* 12:40–41, according to which the exodus from Egypt would take place in the year 390 counting from Abraham's arrival in Canaan, while the entry of the whole nation in Canaan would occur forty years later, that is in the year 430 from Abraham's arrival in Canaan. Assuming such an interpretation, Amram would father Aaron in the year seventy-six of his life, and Moses in his 79th year. (25) Starting from Abraham's arrival in Canaan, the birth of Aaron would occur in 307, while that of Moses in 310, after the death of Levi in 304. In order to find supportive arguments to his theory, Grelot points to *Ez* 4:5–6 where the prophet bears the sins of Israel for 390 days, while those of Judah for 40 days. When summed, these two numbers give the total of 430, which corresponds to the number of the years mentioned in *Exod* 12:40. According to Grelot (1971: 391), “la coïncidence est pour le moins curieuse.” In a second article Grelot (1975: 566) further develops his theory and claims that

(25) Grelot's dates for the birth of Aaron and Moses are close to the data given by Demetrius, the third century B.C. Jewish historian, who claims that Amram fathered Aaron at the age of seventy-five, and Moses when he was seventy-eight years old, see Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 9.21.19; text and transl. in Holladay 1983: 74–75. Puech (2001: 277–278) notes that Demetrius gives the year of the conception while Grelot that of the birth of the patriarch. In this case Grelot's reconstruction would concord with Demetrius' data. On the other hand, Demetrius' chronology is at odds with the priestly chronology found in the *Visions of Levi*, cf. Drawnel 2004: 309, 313–314, 317, 325.

Amram's stay in Canaan for forty-one years according to the *Visions of Amram* (4Q544 frg. 1 6) constitutes an artificial elongation of the older chronology according to which the exodus from Egypt would take place in the year 390, while the return of the whole nation to Canaan in the year 430 according to the calculation that begins with Abraham's arrival in Canaan.

Unfortunately, Grelot's theory does not find a decisive confirmation either in the biblical texts or in the *Visions of Amram* or in other pseudepigraphic traditions. Additionally, when one assumes with Grelot (1975: 565), that Amram returns from Canaan in 347 after forty-one years of absence from his wife that remained in Egypt, and only then fathers Aaron, then the birth of Mariam ten years earlier than Aaron is hardly explicable. The starting point for Grelot theory seems also questionable: there is no evidence for Grelot's claim that the birth of Amram's children in the old age of the patriarch constitutes an exegetical or textual problem for the author of the *Visions*.

#### 4. The Introductory Narrative of the *Visions* of Amram and the Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

After having analyzed the literary structure of the introductory narrative of the *Visions of Amram* together with the content of its summary heading, it is possible now to return to the question of the literary relationship between the *Visions* and the Greek *Testaments*. The notes presented in Appendix I compare the introductory narrative of the Greek *Testaments* with the literary structure of the introductory narrative found in the *Visions of Amram* in order to find the literary elements common to the two texts. The comparison brings also forth many differences between the two texts, and makes it clear that the literary structure of the *Visions of Amram* exerted some influence on the redactors of the Greek *Testaments*, not vice versa. The notes that follow summarize the existing similarities and differences, and make an attempt to critically assess von Nordheim's assumption about the identity of the literary genres found in the two compositions.

According to von Nordheim, the introductory narrative (*Anfangsrahmen*) of the literary genre of a testament is composed of the following elements: title of the work, and the name of the fictitious author, the addressees that is recipients of the speech, indication of the imminent death of the speaker in the first or third person singular, age of the speaker and comparative chronology, circumstances of the incoming speech of the patriarch, introductory formula of the speech. The analysis of the content of the introductory narrative of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* indicates that the thematic pattern proposed by the



German scholar is mostly irregular, and all its elements are rarely found together in the introductory narrative of the single *Testaments*. The term διαθήκη (*T. Reub.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1) is not found in the titles of all the *Testaments* and it often appears instead of the noun λόγοι (*T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1). Von Nordheim's distinction between the title of the work and the name of the patriarch is unnecessary, because in each case the name of the patriarch makes part of the title. The sons of the patriarch as recipients of the speech are usually mentioned after the title of the book, but sometimes they appear later in the structure of the introductory narrative (*T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:2, 5; *T. Jos.* 1:1). The verbs that express the patriarch's instruction of his sons differ considerably (ἐντέλλομαι: *T. Reub.* 1:1 λαλέω: *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1; διατίθημι: *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Zeb.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1; λέγω: *T. Dan* 1:1), and are sometimes omitted (*T. Jos.* 1:1; *T. Iss.* 1:1). The indication of the imminent death of the speaker is mentioned by the narrator, but once by the narrator (*T. Naph.* 1:1) and by the patriarch himself (*T. Naph.* 1:3). The chronology of Joseph's death in relation to the patriarch's life span is in most cases omitted (*T. Lev.* 1:1–2; *T. Jud.* 1:1–2; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1–2a; *T. Naph.* 1:1–5a; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1–2a; *T. Jos.* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1–2a). The circumstances of the incoming speech of the patriarch vary in length, deal in most cases with patriarch's illness (*T. Reub.* 1:2; *T. Sim.* 1:2), and/or with ingathering of his sons (*T. Reub.* 1:2; *T. Sim.* 1:2; *T. Jud.* 1:2; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:2a), but sometimes they are also omitted (*T. Zeb.* 1:1–2; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1). In several cases the good health of the patriarch is stated (*T. Lev.* 1:2; *T. Naph.* 1:2; *T. Ash.* 1:2a), and the introductory narrative also speaks about patriarch's kissing of his sons (*T. Sim.* 1:2; *T. Benj.* 1:2a; cf. *T. Reub.* 1:5). The formula that introduces direct speech appears consistently but its form also varies.

Von Nordheim calls his careful analysis of the initial narrative of the *Testaments* stylistic or formal, but in fact it amounts to the gathering of common thematic points presented in the order of their appearance in the Greek text. Since the variability of the thematic points is considerable in the initial narrative as well as in other two parts of his division (central section, and concluding narrative), von Nordheim recognizes it in his research (26) and being probably conscious of the deficiency of this description, eventually reduces the number of the

(26) Nordheim 1980: 230: "Die Variabilität der Gattung zeigt sich zunächst darin, daß einzelne Formenelemente sehr überbetont, ausgedehnt werden können, andere dagegen fehlen."



formal elements characteristic to the testamentary genre to a few points only: the information about the death of the speaker, his speech, and his death. (27) His thematic approach to the literary analysis allowed him to find in the introductory narrative of the *Visions of Amram* the same literary genre of a testament. In his recent article Jörg Frey, who had already access to the full Aramaic text of the *Visions*, followed von Nordheim's approach and classified the *Visions of Amram* as the best, and probably, the only, example of a testament from the Qumran caves.

The question, however, arises whether from the methodological point of view it is admissible and commendable to interpret the literary form of a chronologically older text by the means of a younger composition, especially in the case when it is widely assumed that the latter composition has been subjected to many redactional changes and elaborations. While seeing many thematic common points between the introductory narrative of the *Visions* and his description of the testamentary genre, von Nordheim has to acknowledge that the term "testament" is conspicuously lacking in the former work, and that the synchronistic chronology in the *Visions* does not refer to the year in which Joseph died. The second question is whether in order to properly describe the literary form of an ancient document it is enough to concentrate with von Nordheim on its vocabulary only, or perhaps the presentation of its literary structure is also necessary.

The analysis of a literary work cannot limit itself to the analysis of its vocabulary, although this topic is of great importance for the proper description of a literary genre. The careful reading of the introductory narrative of the *Visions of Amram* has indicated a well-defined literary structure inherent in the text. The comparison of the elements of this literary structure with the introductory narrative of the Greek *Testaments* (cf. Appendix I) shows that some elements of the Aramaic structure are preserved in the *Testaments*, but also some parts of the narrative have been omitted or purposefully changed. Additionally, the change in vocabulary used points to a different perspective adopted by the redactors of the *Testaments*. The notes that follow try to summarize the structural and thematic changes that occurred in the redactional process of the *Testaments*.

The introductory narrative of the *Visions* is readily divided into three sections: introductory heading (I. A–D), wedding of Mariam and

(27) Nordheim 1980: 230: "Nicht alle diese Formelemente müssen in jedem Testament erscheinen, obwohl einige in jedem Fall unverzichtbar sind: der Tod des Redenden und eine entsprechende Ankündigung; eine Rede die auf die Todessituation Bezug nimmt und in deren Zentrum Anweisungen für die Hinterbliebenen, den Nachfolger, das Volk stehen."

Uzziel (II. E–G), and calling of Aaron (III. H–J). Even a cursory comparison with the *Testaments* shows that the Greek compositions are related to the summary heading of the *Visions*, while the second and third section are almost totally omitted in the Greek text. It is questionable whether the wedding of Mariam and Uzziel was written as a circumstantial background to Amram's speech, as the description of the literary genre by von Nordheim would suggest. The meaning of the second section (II. E–G) must be read in the context of the *Visions of Levi* and *Admonitions of Qahat*, where the endogamic principle in the marital law is of extreme importance. Thus the second section emphatically stresses the same principle for Amram's brother and daughter, and the marriage is arranged by Amram himself, which additionally underlines the importance of endogamy. The redactors of the *Testaments* omitted the description of the wedding banquet, which unequivocally proves that they were not interested in the priestly endogamic principle, or perhaps did not endorse it. There is one case though, in which the introductory narrative of the *Testament of Naphtali* does preserve a description of a solemn feast (*T. Naph.* 1:2) prepared by the patriarch for his sons, but any reference to the wedding ceremony is carefully omitted, perhaps because of its incongruity with the incoming death of the patriarch, or for a sheer lack of interest in the endogamic principle. The circumstances of the patriarchs' death in the *Testaments* deal in most cases with his illness (*T. Reub.* 1:2; *T. Sim.* 1:2), or with his good health (*T. Lev.* 1:2; *T. Naph.* 1:2; *T. Ash.* 1:2a), or with his kissing of his sons (*T. Sim.* 1:2; *T. Benj.* 1:2a; cf. *T. Reub.* 1:5). There are a few cases (*T. Zeb.* 1:1–2; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1) in which any circumstance in which the speech occurs is not present in the introductory narrative. All these thematic elements are clearly secondary and are not directly related to the introductory narrative of the *Visions of Amram*.

In some cases the Greek *Testaments* provide the information about the ingathering of the patriarchs' sons (*T. Reub.* 1:2; *T. Sim.* 1:2; *T. Jud.* 1:2; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:2a), which von Nordheim classifies as one of the elements describing the circumstances in which the patriarch delivers his speech. (28) The two cases in which the sons gather because of the illness of the patriarch (*T. Reub.* 1:2; *T. Sim.* 1:2) are secondary and do not depend on the *Visions of Amram*. *T. Jud.* 1:2 does not give any reason for the ingathering, but *T. Iss.* 1:1 and *T. Dan* 1:2a state that the patriarch calls (καλέσας) his sons and then addresses them in his speech. These last two cases seem to be related to the third section of the introductory narrative in the

(28) See Nordheim 1980: 13, 15, 22, 31, 42.

*Visions of Amram* where the patriarch takes the initiative to call his son Aaron. The relation between the two texts, however, is limited to the use of the verb “to call” and to the father-son relationship. Thus except for the case of *T. Iss.* 1:1 and *T. Dan* 1:2a, the third section of the introductory narrative of the *Visions of Amram* is not extant in the Greek *Testament*. The notable exception should probably be granted to the phrase introducing direct speech in the *Visions* (III. J.), which regularly appears before the speech in the *Testaments*, although with some modifications. Yet it is not certain whether the introductory phrase in the *Testaments* is attributable to the influence of the *Visions of Amram*, because it is a standard form for introducing a speech found in many other literary genres and texts.

Thus the second (II. E–G) and third part (III. H–J) of the introductory narrative of the *Visions of Amram* are in most cases omitted by the *Testaments*, with a few minor points of contact that suggest a distant relationship only. The summary heading (I. A–D) of the *Visions*, however, appears to have exerted much greater influence on the *Testaments* in relation to the literary structure and selection of vocabulary. The fourfold division of the summary heading in the *Testaments* appears quite regularly, although there occur many instances of omissions of some of its elements as well as of its vocabulary. The most notable departure from the literary structure of the *Visions of Amram* is the abandonment of the synchronism with the Egyptian exile (I. D) and the introduction of the date of Joseph’s death instead. Such a change stressed not only the importance of Joseph who plays a prominent role in the *Testaments*, but it also focused on the death of yet another patriarch, which certainly added to the testamentary character of the literary form. On the other hand, the omission of the Egyptian exile chronology left out one important aspect of priestly theology, namely the chronology of the priestly patriarch’s life in relation to the temporal framework of early Israel. One should note, however, that the date of Joseph’s death is found in a number of cases only (*T. Reub.* 1:2; *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Zeb.* 1:1), and is mostly abandoned in the introductory narrative of the *Testaments* (*T. Lev.* 1:1–2; *T. Jud.* 1:1–2; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1–2a; *T. Naph.* 1:1–5a; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1–2a; *T. Jos.* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1–2a).

The third element of the summary heading in the *Visions of Amram* (I. C) stresses the last year of the patriarch’s life, and finds its reflection in the introductory narrative of the *Testaments*, except for *T. Lev.* 1:1–2; *T. Jud.* 1:1–2; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1. The age of the patriarch at the moment of his death has been transferred to the concluding narrative in *T. Lev.* 19:4 and *T. Jud.* 26:2, while in *T. Iss.* 7:1 Issachar’s age is given in the last section of his speech. The transfer

of one of the elements of the introductory narrative to the conclusion of the whole work helps to build the testamentary pattern of the composition. Note that in the Aramaic *Visions of Levi*, Levi's age at the moment of his death is found in the concluding statement (VLev. 81) of the autobiographical section (VLev. 62–81), while the redactors of the *Testament of Levi* transferred it to the concluding narrative (T. Lev. 19:4).

The second element (I. B) of the summary heading in the *Visions of Amram* stresses the instructional character of Amram's speech pronounced on the day of his death. Mentioning the death of the patriarch is not the decisive element for calling the whole literary form of the Aramaic text a testament, but it certainly situates the whole speech at the end of Amram's life, and is related to the third and fourth element of the summary heading (I. C and I. D) that deal with the chronological matters. While the two verbs (אָהַר and פָּקַד) used in the Aramaic text bring the didactic character of the whole work to the fore, the *Testaments* cite only one verb, and only in one case the Greek verb ἐντέλλομαι (T. Reub. 1:1) corresponds to the Aramaic פָּקַד. The other Greek verbs used in the *Testaments* to indicate the speech transmission to the patriarch's sons do not render the same didactic aspect of the Aramaic literary composition (λαλέω: T. Sim. 1:1; T. Jud. 1:1; T. Gad 1:1; T. Ash. 1:1; διατίθημι: T. Lev. 1:1; T. Zeb. 1:1; T. Naph. 1:1; T. Benj. 1:1; λέγω: T. Dan 1:1).

The first element of the summary heading in the *Visions of Amram* (I. A) contains the title of the whole work and stresses its literary and scribal character. It also directly refers to Amram's priestly credentials by citing his priestly genealogy. The title of the work, *words of the vision(s) of Amram*, refers to the oral teaching of the patriarch, shows the revelatory character of his words, and gives the name of the pseudepigraphic author of the whole composition. The Greek *Testaments* introduce a number of important changes to the first line of the composition. First of all, the Aramaic noun כְּתָב has been consistently omitted; secondly, the term חֲזוֹן has never been used in the title of the *Testaments*, and thirdly, the genealogical credentials of the patriarch have never been cited. These changes lessen the written character of the patriarchal tradition, omit the revelatory elements from the title of the *Testaments*, and avoid any genealogical reference to Jacob and his forefathers. The overall perspective is therefore greatly changed. Von Nordheim notes the presence of the term חֲזוֹן in the title of the *Visions of Amram*, but he claims that the actual vision in the central section of the composition acquires the function of admonitions or rather instructions concerning the conduct of Amram's sons. His observation correctly explains the didactic func-

tion of the whole work expressly stated in the next line (I. B), but it does not concord with his statement about the relationship between vision as a literary form and testament as a literary form. He affirms that the testamentary form may include other literary forms for which it serves as a “Rahmengattung,” but which are foreign to the testamentary “Gattung”; among the literary genres that are foreign to the testamentary form von Nordheim lists visions and dreams. (29) Such a distinction effectively discredits the *Visions of Amram* as a testamentary genre because the visionary experience contained in the vision of the two angels properly corresponds to the term *חזון* found in the title, to Amram’s predictions about the future of Aaron and Moses, and to the didactic character of the whole work.

The title of the Greek *Testaments* often preserves the term “words” (λόγοι) from the Aramaic *Vorlage* of the literary pattern (*T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1), but in some cases the term διαθήκη is introduced instead (*T. Reub.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1). It is evident that the term διαθήκη is secondary in relation to the *Visions of Amram* where it is simply absent. Von Nordheim observes that the term is not present in every text considered as a testament, it belongs to the juridical language where it denotes the last disposition concerning one’s property before one’s death, and in this sense it is not found in the Greek *Testaments*. (30) He thus distinguishes between the meaning of the Greek term on the one hand and the testamentary form found in the Greek compositions on the other. By doing so, however, he does not answer the question why the redactors of the Greek texts introduced the term into the very title of some of the *Testaments*, and it is highly unlikely that they distinguished between the legal meaning of the term and its application to the literary form. It is rather certain that the introduction of the term is related to conscious redactional activity that stressed and brought forth the literary elements related to the death of the patriarch. At least in the case of the *Visions of Amram* calling the Aramaic work a testament amounts to an anachronistic transfer of later terminology on an earlier work distant in time from the *Testaments* for around four hundred years.

When analyzing the introductory narrative of the Greek *Testaments* from the perspective of the literary structure and form found in

(29) Nordheim 1980: 231: “Weiterhin zeigt sich die Variabilität der Testamentsform auch darin, daß sie andere Gattungen in sich aufnehmen kann. Das Testament wird so zur Rahmengattung. Solche aufgenommenen Gattungen sind: negative Bekenntnisreihen, weisheitliche Lehrreden, Rechtsentscheide, Bundesformular, Visionen, Träume, Himmelsreisen und Hymnen.”

(30) See Nordheim 1980: 241.

the earlier Aramaic work, the summary heading of the *Visions of Amram* appears as a literary model for the composers of the Greek *Testaments*, but the *Testaments* do not preserve its full literary structure even in one case. It is therefore misleading to reconstruct on the basis of the Greek *Testaments* broad thematic categories and impose them on the Aramaic composition. Although the full appreciation of the literary structure and form of the *Visions of Amram* cannot be achieved because of the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts, the analysis of its introductory narrative points out its careful composition and priestly character. The didactic and revelatory elements of the Aramaic text suggest the didactic context of knowledge transmission where the priestly knowledge is passed on from father to son and the principle of endogamy is visibly asserted. The Greek *Testaments* do not present themselves as directly related to the social context of the Levitical family where the transmission of priestly lore took place. This fact additionally proves that not only the literary form of the Aramaic text is different from the testamentary literature, but also the setting in life of priestly didactic literature is foreign to the Greek *Testaments*. The omission of Isaac's priestly instruction found in the Aramaic *Visions of Levi* from the Greek *Testament of Levi* does not seem to be casual in this respect.

The *Visions of Amram* belong to the same type of didactic and revelatory literature as the *Visions of Levi* and *Admonitions of Qahat*. The chronological interest and didactic forms of knowledge transmission found in the *Aramaic Astronomical Book* points to the same Levitical circles as authors or transmitters of the calendaric traditions related to Babylonian astrological texts. The metrological section of Isaac's priestly instruction in the *Visions of Levi* (vv. 31–47) builds the arithmetical pattern of metrological units on the basis of the lexical lists commonly used in the cuneiform scribal education in ancient Babylonia in all periods of its attested history. These evident borrowings into the structure of Jewish priestly culture and religion suggest an ongoing and fruitful dialogue with Babylonian didactic and religious traditions, hardly seclusion from them. The literary form of the Levitical compositions properly expresses these priestly and didactic interests. In order to understand them and explain their literary form there is no need to have recourse to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a later Greek composition sometimes called by its redactors a "testament." Conversely, the *Testaments* need to be compared with the literary forms preserved in the Aramaic didactic literature in order to see the development and modification of the literary forms inherent in the Aramaic text of the *Visions of Amram*. Thus von Nordheim's broad thematic categories retrieved from the *Testaments* and

arbitrarily imposed on the much earlier Aramaic text should not be taken as methodologically sound literary criteria properly describing the literary form of the *Visions*. The literary genres do change and undergo modifications throughout the literary history of human creative production, (31) and this process is plainly attested in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

## APPENDIX

### Comparison Between the Introductory Sections of the *Testaments* and the Literary Structure of the *Visions of Amram* (32)

<i>T. Reub.</i> 1:1–3a (33)
Ἄντίγραφον διαθήκη Ῥουβήμ, ὅσα ἐνετείλατο τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὶν ἢ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτόν, ἐν ἑκατοστῷ εἰκοστῷ πέπτῳ ἔτει τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ. 2. μετὰ ἔτη δύο τῆς τελευτῆς Ἰωσήφ ἀρρωστοῦντι συνήχθησαν ἐπισκέψασθαι αὐτόν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ υἱοὶ τῶν υἴων αὐτοῦ. 3. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς:

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον correctly translates the Aramaic term פֿרשגן, and it appears as the opening word at the beginning of each *Testament*. The Aramaic expression מלי חיות כתב has been substituted by διαθέκης, see *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1. In a similar way, Amram's name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Jacob's eldest son, Reuben, but any genealogical indication is missing.
- B. The Greek text omits כול, but it correctly translates the relative די, cf. LXX where ὅσα often translates אשר (e.g., *Gen* 1:31; 6:17, 22, etc.). The Aramaic verb פקד is correctly rendered with ἐνετείλατο. The first Aramaic verb (אחרי) and the pronoun אנן have been omitted, while the temporal expression ביום מותה has been substituted with πρὶν ἢ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτόν; see the verb "to die" ἀποθανεῖν in *T. Jud.* 1:1; θανεῖν in *T. Sim.* 1:1; ἀποθνήσκειν in *T. Jos.* 1:1.
- C. The year of the patriarch's death is adduced, the expression τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ substitutes שנתא די מותה.
- D. The synchronization with Joseph's death substitutes the synchronization with the beginning of the Egyptian exile, but there is no numerical reference to the year of Joseph's death.

(31) Generic reflection on transformations of literary genres is conspicuously present in modern literary criticism theories, see, e.g., Fowler 1982: 170–190 and cited there scholarly literature.

(32) The literary structure of the initial narrative of the *Visions of Amram* has been discussed in §2 of this study.

(33) The Greek text of the *Testaments* is cited according to the critical edition by de Jonge and Hollander 1978.



II. E–G. Omitted.

III. H–I. In contradistinction to the Aramaic pattern, the Greek text adds the information about Reuben’s illness and about the ingathering of his sons and grandsons who come to visit him.

III. J. There follows a standard formula that introduces direct speech.

*T. Sim.* 1:1–2

Ἀντίγραφον λόγων Συμεών, ἃ ἐλάλησε τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ πρὸ τοῦ θανεῖν αὐτόν, ἑκατοστῷ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ. ἐν ᾧ ἔτει ἀπέθανεν Ἰωσήφ. 2. ἦλθεν γὰρ ἐπισκέψασθαι αὐτόν ἀρρωστοῦντα, καὶ ἐνισχύσας ἐκάθισε καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·

I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον corresponds to פֿרשֿג; in the Aramaic expression חזת מלי כתב only the word מלי = λόγων has been preserved, see *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1. Amram’s name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Simeon, but any genealogical indication is missing.

B. The Aramaic text is rather freely rendered here, with the verb ἐλάλησε introduced probably under the influence of λόγων; cf. *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1. The reference to the day of the patriarch’s death is substituted by a general temporal phrase πρὸ τοῦ θανεῖν αὐτόν; cf. the verb “to die” ἀποθανεῖν in *T. Reub.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; ἀποθνήσκειν in *T. Jos.* 1:1.

C. The Greek expression τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ is absent in Aramaic, while the phrase חזת מלי שנתא די מותה is omitted in Greek.

D. The synchronization with Joseph’s death substitutes the synchronization with the beginning of the Egyptian exile, but there is no numerical reference to the year of Joseph’s death.

II. E–G. Omitted.

III. H–I. In contradistinction to the Aramaic pattern, the Greek text adds the information about Simeon’s illness and about the ingathering of his sons who come to visit him. Simeon regains his strength, sits down and kisses his descendants, cf. *T. Reub.* 1:5; *T. Benj.* 1:2.

III. J. There follows a standard formula that introduces direct speech.

*T. Lev.* 1:1–2

Ἀντίγραφον λόγων Λευί, ὅσα διέθετο τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτόν, κατὰ πάντα ἃ ποιήσουσιν καὶ ὅσα συναντήσιν αὐτοῖς ἕως ἡμέρας κρίσεως. 2. ὑγιαίνων ἦν ὅτε ἐκάλεσεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἑαυτόν: ὥφθη γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅτι μέλλει ἀποθνήσκειν· καὶ ὅτε συνήχθησαν, εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς·

I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον corresponds to פֿרשֿג; in the Aramaic expression חזת מלי כתב only the word מלי = λόγων has been preserved, see *T. Sim.*



- 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1. Amram's name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Levi, but any genealogical indication is missing. The omission of any genealogical detail in the case of the priestly patriarch is particularly troubling because of a large genealogical section in *VLev.* 62–81.
- B. The verb διέθετο does not translate the Aramaic verbs, and it has been probably introduced under the influence of διαθήκη, cf. *T. Zeb.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1. The expression πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτόν changes the preposition ב, omits וי, and properly translates מותה; for τελευτή translating the Hebrew מות, see *LXX Gen* 27:2; *Deut* 31:29; 33:1; *Josh* 1:1; *Judg* 1:1, etc.
- C. The year of the patriarch's death has been omitted. Note that in the *Visions of Levi* the year of the patriarch's death is mentioned only at the end of the genealogical and biographical section in v. 81. The redactors of the Greek *T. Levi* transposed this detail to the end of the whole composition in *T. Levi* 19:4, and set it in the third person singular narrative.
- D. The synchronization with Joseph's death is also missing. The last two clauses refer to the future destiny of Levi's sons and stress not the autobiographical account but the visionary character of Levi's predictions about the future of his sons, so dominant in the *Visions of Levi*, see vv. 64, 67, 98; cf. vv. 99–104. The second source of Levi's foreknowledge of his sons' destiny are the books read by him, see *VLev.* 99. The Greek *Testament of Levi* also dedicates a large section to the previsions about the future destiny of Levi's sons (chs. 14–17; cf. ch. 18).

## II. E–G. Omitted.

- III. H–I. Verse 2 introduces the information about Levi's good health and about his initiative to call his sons. The reason for the ingathering is the revelation about Levi's approaching death. The aorist ὤφθη "it was shown" from ὁράω "to see" assumes that Levi receives a revelation about his future; the *Visions of Levi* frequently use the verb ἵκη "to see" in relation to Levi's visionary experience, see *VLev.* 1b l. 15, l. 16; 6; 67, 98; v. 64 (ὁράω). In the Greek *Testament of Levi*, the verb ὁράω frequently refers to Levi's visions, see 2:7, 8, 9, 11; 3:1; 5:1; 6:8; 8:1, 2; 9:2; 11:3, 5; cf. 9:3. Note that in v. 1 the narrator stresses the visionary character of Levi's predictions about the future of his sons.

- III. J. There follows a standard formula that introduces direct speech.

*T. Jud.* 1:1–2

Ἀντίγραφον λόγων Ἰούδα, ὅσα ἐλάλησε τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτόν. 2. συναχθέντες ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς:

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον corresponds to פְּרָשָׁן; in the Aramaic expression כְּתָב מְלִי חוּזָא only the word מְלִי = λόγων has been preserved, *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1. Amram's name and its

priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Judah, but any genealogical indication is missing.

- B. The Aramaic כּוֹל is omitted, while the verb ἐλάλησε does not translate the Aramaic text, and was introduced probably under the influence of the preceding λόγων; cf. *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1. As in other cases, the preposition πρὸ substitutes the Aramaic בּ, and the nominalized infinitive τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν loosely relates to the temporal expression בּיּוֹם מוֹתָהּ; see the verb “to die” τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν in *T. Reub.* 1:1; θανεῖν in *T. Sim.* 1:1; ἀποθνήσκειν in *T. Jos.* 1:1.

C. Omitted.

D. Omitted.

II. E–G. Omitted.

III. H–I. V. 2 briefly notes that Judah’s sons gather around him, with the exclusion of any initiative from the patriarch himself.

III. J. There follows a standard formula that introduces direct speech.

<i>T. Iss.</i> 1:1
--------------------

Ἀντίγραφον λόγων Ἰσαχάρ, καλέσας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
---

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον corresponds to פּרשָׁן; in the Aramaic expression חוּת מְלִי כְּתַב only the word מְלִי = λόγων has been preserved, see *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1. Amram’s name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Issachar, but any genealogical indication is missing.

B. Omitted.

C. Omitted.

D. Omitted.

II. E–G. Omitted.

III. H–I. The participle in the clause καλέσας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς seems to be related to the calling of Aaron (line 8: קָרָא).

III. J. The Greek clause contains the verb εἶπεν that introduces direct speech, cf. 4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c, 9a: אָמַר לָהֶם.

<i>T. Zeb.</i> 1:1–2
----------------------

Ἀντίγραφον Ζαβουλών, ὃ διέθετο τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ ἑκατοστῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ, μετὰ δύο ἔτη τοῦ θανάτου Ἰωσήφ. 2. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
---

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον corresponds to פּרשָׁן; the Aramaic expression חוּת מְלִי כְּתַב has been omitted. Amram’s name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Zebulun, but any genealogical indication is missing.

- B. The verb διέθετο certainly does not render the Aramaic text, and is clearly related to διαθέκη, cf. also *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1.
- C. The year of the patriarch's life (τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ) is presented in the Aramaic text as the year of his death: **היא שנתא די מותה**
- D. The synchronization with the Egyptian exile has been substituted by the reference to Joseph's death, but his age is not mentioned.
- II. E–G. Omitted.
- III. H–I. Omitted
- III. J. There follows a standard formula that introduces direct speech.

*T. Dan* 1:1–2a

Ἀντίγραφον λόγων Δάν, ὃν εἶπε τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν αὐτοῦ ἑκατοστῷ εἰκοστῷ πέμτῳ ἔτει τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ.  
2. καλέσας τὴν πατριὰν αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν·

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον corresponds to **פרשנ**; in the Aramaic expression **מלי חוות כתב** only the word **מלי** = λόγων has been preserved, see *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1. Amram's name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Dan, but any genealogical indication is missing.
- B. The Greek εἶπε does not translate the Aramaic verbs, and the expression ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν αὐτοῦ paraphrases the Aramaic **ביום מותה**.
- C. The year of the patriarch's life (τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ) is presented in the Aramaic text as the year of his death: **היא שנתא די מותה**
- D. Omitted.
- II. E–G. Omitted.
- III. H–I. The participle in the clause καλέσας τὴν πατριὰν αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν seems to be related to the calling of Aaron (line 8: **קרא**).
- III. J. The Greek clause contains the verb εἶπεν that introduces direct speech, cf. 4Q543 frg. 1 a, b, c, 9a: **ואמר לה**.

*T. Naph.* 1:1–5a

Ἀντίγραφον διαθήκης Νεφθαλίμ, ἥς διέθετο ἐν καιρῷ τέλους αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἔτει ἑκατοστῷ τριακοστῷ δευτέρῳ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ. 2. συνελθόντων τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἑβδόμῳ μηνί, τετάρτῃ τοῦ μηνός, ὑγιαίνοντος αὐτοῦ, ἐποίησε δεῖπνον αὐτοῖς καὶ κώθωνα. 3. καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐξυπνισθῆναι αὐτὸν τὸ πρωῒ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Ἀποθνήσκω· καὶ οὐκ ἐπίστευον αὐτῷ. καὶ εὐλογῶν κύριον ἐκραταίωσεν ὅτι μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον τὸ χθὲς ἀποθανεῖται. 5. ἤρξατο οὖν λέγειν τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ·

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον correctly translates the Aramaic term **פרשנ**. The Aramaic expression **מלי חוות כתב** has been substituted by διαθήκης, see

- T. Reub.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1. In a similar way, Amram's name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Naphtali, but any genealogical indication is missing.
- B. The verb διέθετο certainly does not render the Aramaic text, and is clearly related to διαθήκης, cf. also *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Zeb.* 1:1; *T. Benj.* 1:1. The Greek expression ἐν καιρῷ τέλους αὐτοῦ paraphrases the Aramaic ביום מותה.
- C. The year of the patriarch's life (τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ) is presented in the Aramaic text as the year of his death: היא שנתא דימותה.
- D. Omitted.
- II. E–G. In v. 2 Naphtali's sons gather in order to take part in a feast of food and wine. This circumstance is not found in the introductory narrative of the Greek *Testaments*, and it seems to be influenced by the *Visions of Amram* in this respect. However, the Aramaic tradition is tangibly modified, because the Greek text does not speak about the wedding of Naphtali's sons, and thus any reference to endogamy is omitted.
- III. H–I. Similarly to the Aramaic account, the Greek text in vv. 3–4 reports what happened after the feast, but the attention is focused on Naphtali's imminent death. Differently from the Aramaic text, the patriarch does not call his sons, because the feast was made for them (v. 2), and thus they are already present around him.
- III. J. The standard formula that introduces direct speech includes the reference to the patriarch's sons, cf. v. 2.

<i>T. Gad</i> 1:1
-------------------

Ἀντίγραφον διαθήκης Γάδ, ἃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτὸς τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν ἔτει ἑκατοστῷ εἰκοστῷ ἑβδόμῳ ζωῆς αὐτοῦ λέγων:
--

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον correctly translates the Aramaic term פֿרשגן. The Aramaic expression מלי חוות כתב has been substituted by διαθήκης, see *T. Reub.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1. In a similar way, Amram's name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Gad, but any genealogical indication is missing.
- B. The Aramaic כול is omitted, while the verb ἐλάλησεν does not translate the Aramaic text, see *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1.
- C. The year of the patriarch's life (ζωῆς αὐτοῦ) is presented in the Aramaic text as the year of his death: היא שנתא די מותה.
- D. Omitted.
- II. E–G. Omitted.
- III. H–I. Omitted.
- III. J. The participle λέγων introduces direct speech, cf. 4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 9a.

*T. Ash.* 1:1–2a

Ἀντίγραφον διαθήκης Ἀσὴρ, ἃ ἐλάλησεν τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ ἑκατοστῷ εἰκοστῷ ἔκτῳ ἔτει ζωῆς αὐτοῦ. 2. ἔτι ὑγιαίνων εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς·

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον correctly translates the Aramaic term פִּרְשָׁן. The Aramaic expression מְלִי חוּת כְּתָב has been substituted by διαθήκης, see *T. Reub.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Jos.* 1:1. In a similar way, Amram's name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Asher, but any genealogical indication is missing.
- B. The Greek ἐλάλησεν does not render the Aramaic verbs, similarly to *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1. The Aramaic expression בְּיוֹם מוֹתָה has been omitted.
- C. The year of the patriarch's life (ζωῆς αὐτοῦ) is presented in the Aramaic text as the year of his death: הָיָא שְׁנַתָּא דִּי מוֹתָה.
- D. Omitted.
- II. E–G. Omitted.
- III. H–I. The reference to Asher's being still in good health in v. 2a constitutes a later development, not present in the Aramaic text of the *Visions of Amram* cf. also *T. Lev.* 1:2; *T. Naph.* 1:2.
- III. J. The clause εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς introduces direct speech, cf. 4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 9a.

*T. Jos.* 1:1

Ἀντίγραφον διαθήκης Ἰωσήφ. ἐν τῷ μέλλειν αὐτὸν ἀποθνήσκειν καλέσας τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον correctly translates the Aramaic term פִּרְשָׁן. The Aramaic expression מְלִי חוּת כְּתָב has been substituted by διαθήκης, see *T. Reub.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1; *T. Gad* 1:1; *T. Ash.* 1:1. In a similar way, Amram's name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Joseph, but any genealogical indication is missing.
- B. The Greek circumstantial expression ἐν τῷ μέλλειν αὐτὸν ἀποθνήσκειν paraphrases the Aramaic text that does not use the verb (בְּיוֹם מוֹתָה) and refers to the day of the death; cf. the verb “to die” ἀποθανεῖν in *T. Reub.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; θανεῖν in *T. Sim.* 1:1.
- C. Omitted.
- D. Omitted.
- II. E–G. Omitted.
- III. H–I. The participle καλέσας and the expression εἶπεν αὐτοῖς introduce direct speech, cf. 4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 8–9a וְאָמַר לֵהּ... קָרָא. While the reference to his sons (τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ) can be explained as a remnant from I. B in the Aramaic text, the calling of his brothers (τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ)

does not certainly stem from the Aramaic pattern, but it depends on *Gen* 50:24 where Joseph addresses his brothers before his death; cf. *T. Reub.* 1:4.

- III. J. The clause εἶπεν αὐτοῖς introduces direct speech, cf. 4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 9a.

<i>T. Benj.</i> 1:1–2a
------------------------

Ἀντίγραφον λόγων Βενιαμίν, ὃν διέθετο τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ, ζήσας ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἰκοσιπέντε. 2. καὶ φιλήσας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν·
--

- I. A. The term ἀντίγραφον corresponds to פֶּרֶשׁ; in the Aramaic expression כְּתָב מִלִּי חֲזוֹת only the word מִלִּי = λόγων has been preserved, see *T. Sim.* 1:1; *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Jud.* 1:1; *T. Iss.* 1:1; *T. Dan* 1:1. Amram's name and its priestly genealogy have been substituted by the name of Benjamin, but any genealogical indication is missing.
- B. The verb διέθετο certainly does not render the Aramaic text, and is clearly related to διαθήκης cf. also *T. Lev.* 1:1; *T. Zeb.* 1:1; *T. Naph.* 1:1.
- C. The participle ζήσας is nowhere to be found in the Aramaic text that refers to the year of the patriarch's death, cf.  
הָיָא שְׁנַת דִּי מוֹתָהּ.
- D. Omitted.
- II. E–G. Omitted.
- III. H–I. The phrase φιλήσας αὐτοὺς is not related to the introductory narrative of the *Visions of Amram*, but see *T. Reub.* 1:5; *T. Sim.* 1:2.
- III. J. The verb εἶπεν introduces direct speech, cf. 4Q543 frg. 1a, b, c 9a.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burchard, Christoph. 1965. Review of Marinus de Jonge, *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum: Edited according to Cambridge University Library MS Ff. 1.24 fol. 1.24 203a-262b. RevQ* 5: 281-284.
- Collins, John J. 1984. "Testaments." Pages 325-355 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael Edward Stone (CRJNT 2/2; Assen/Philadelphia: Fortress Press/Van Gorcum).
- de Jonge, Marinus, and H. W. Hollander et al. 1978. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1/2; Leiden: Brill).
- Drawnel, Henryk. 2004. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (JSJS 86; Leiden: Brill).
- Drawnel, Henryk. 2006a. "Priestly Education in the Aramaic *Levi Document* (*Visions of Levi*) and Aramaic *Astronomical Book* (4Q208–211)." *RevQ* 22:547–574.

- Drawnel, Henryk. 2006b. "The Literary Form and Didactic Content of the Admonitions (Testament) of Qahat." Pages 55–73 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez *et al.* (STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill).
- Duke, Robert. 2007. "Moses' Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the *Vision of Amram*." *DSD* 14:34–48.
- Feldman, Louis H. 2000. *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary. Vol. 3: Judean Antiquities 1–4*. Edited by Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill).
- Fowler, Alastair. 1982. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- Frey, Jörg. 2010. "On the Origins of the Genre of the 'Literary Testament': Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and their Relevance for the History of the Genre." In *Aramaica Qumranica*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra (STDJ Leiden: Brill, in print).
- Greenfield, Jonas C., and Michael E. Stone. 1990. "Two Notes on the Aramaic Levi Document." Pages 153–161 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins presented to John Strugnell*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge *et al.* (College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America).
- Grelot, Pierre. 1971. "Quatre cent trente ans (Ex XII, 34)." Pages 383–394 in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*. Edited by André Caquot *et al.* (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve).
- Grelot, Pierre. 1975. "Quatre cents trente ans (Ex 12,40)." Pages 559–570 in *Homenaje a Juan Prado: Miscelánea de estudios bíblicos y hebraicos*. Edited by Lorenzo Alvarez Verdes *et al.* (Madrid: CSIC).
- Holladay, Carl R. 1983. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Volume I. Historians* (Texts and Translations 20; Chico: Scholars Press).
- Hollander, Harm W. 1985. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Pages 71–91 in *Outside the Old Testament*. Edited by Marinus De Jonge (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 B.C. to A.D.200 4 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Kobelski, Paul. 1981. *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (CBQ Monograph Series 10; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America).
- Kugler, Robert A. 1996. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (Early Judaism and its Literature 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Milik, Joseph Thaddée. 1972. "4Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène." *RB* 79:77–97.
- Nordheim, Eckhard von. 1980. *Die Lehre der Alten: I. Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 13; Leiden: Brill).
- Pass, H. L., and J. Arendzen. 1900. "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi." *JQR* 12:651–661.
- Propp, William H. C. 1998. *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York: Doubleday).

- Puech, Émile. 2001. *Qumrân Grotte 4 - XXII: Textes araméens. Première partie: 4Q529-549* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Starcky, Jean. 1956. "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân." *RB* 63:66–67.
- Steiner, Richard C. 1995. "The Heading of the *Book of the Words of Noah* on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a "Lost" Work." *DSD* 2:66–71.

Henryk DRAWNEL



# RETHINKING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN *4QINSTRUCTION* AND *BEN SIRA*

## *Summary*

Since the publication of *4QInstruction*, many scholars have compared this sapiential work with *Ben Sira*. Certain commentators have examined the language and themes in these works to suggest the same period of composition and even a dialogue between the sage Ben Sira and those responsible for *4QInstruction*. This paper analyzes the evidence and the relationship between these two texts. Despite such commonalities as the use of the *Genesis* creation stories to address sin and human accountability, the differences between the two works on eschatology, the search for knowledge, and such mundane matters as surety are significant. *4QInstruction* has more common vocabulary with the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus than with *Ben Sira* and does not necessarily date from the same period as the more elite sage. Comparative analysis of *4QInstruction* and *Ben Sira* highlights significant parallels, but there are also major differences that point to the diversity of the wisdom tradition during the Second Temple period.

## Introduction

**4** *QINSTRUCTION* (*Musar le-Mevin*), the longest sapiential work from the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus, combines the practical advice of an established wisdom tradition with the promise of eternal life for the righteous elect. (1) The addressee in this text, referred to as a

(1) The document is preserved in *1Q26* 4Q415-418, 423, and there are at least six copies. Initially titled *Sapiential Work A*, the common name is now *4QInstruction*. For the primary edition of the text, see J. Strugnell and D.J. Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Mûsâr Lē Mēvîn): 4Q415ff. With a re-edition of 1Q26* (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999). For other detailed analyses of structure and the best reading for the various fragments, see also E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill,

מבין/*mevin* (“understanding one”), receives warnings on a host of practical matters, including farming, surety, and family relations. At the same time, the author of *4QInstruction* places great emphasis on a mystery concept. The phrase רַז נְהִיָּה/*raz nihyeh* (often translated as the “mystery that is to be”) appears repeatedly and seems to describe God’s master plan for the universe, including eschatological reward for the elect category in this text. (2) In several fragments, *4QInstruction* promises eternal life to those righteous persons with access to the *raz nihyeh*.

As this combination of pragmatic advice and apocalyptic eschatology continues to receive attention in scholarly discussions, many basic issues remain open for debate, such as where to place this text chronologically and the relationship between *4QInstruction* and other texts of the Second Temple period, especially sectarian documents from the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus. The fragmentary state of *4QInstruction* and obscure nature of much of the advice make it very difficult to reach definitive answers. For example, we do not know with certainty whether to take the frequent poverty language in the text literally or figuratively, nor can we determine the level of cohesiveness for the group being addressed in this text. (3) Since *4QInstruction* is part of the Scrolls corpus, most commentators have asked whether the document is sectarian and how it relates to the defined communal structures of the *yahad*. The extant fragments share important vocabulary with the undisputed sectarian literature, but at the same time *4QInstruction* affirms individual ownership of property, traditional family life, and fluidity with the larger society. All of these factors have added to the puzzlement over the exact provenance and date for this sapiential text.

In searching for a specific background, one frequent move is to compare *4QInstruction* with *Ben Sira* and to situate it within the same timeframe, in the early part of the second century B.C.E. (4) Since

2001); J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie* (STDJ 81; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

(2) The *raz nihyeh* phrase appears more than 20 times in *4QInstruction*. It consists of the noun רַז, followed by a *nip'al* participle of the verb “to be” (הִיָּה). The term רַז also occurs in *Daniel* and *1 Enoch*, where it generally refers to the content of a divine revelation (e.g., *Dan* 2:28). This phrase can also be found in the *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27 1 i 3-4) and the *Community Rule* (1QS 11:3-4), and therefore it was known within the *yahad*.

(3) M.J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 148-55, cites the difficulty of understanding many of the financial references in *4QInstruction* (i.e., do some of the phrases cite actual hardships or metaphorical poverty?).

(4) Like many modern studies, the current discussion will use “Ben Sira” to refer to the *Wisdom of Ben Sira* (also called *Sirach* and *Ecclesiasticus*) and the author

*Ben Sira* is the longest extant Second Temple instruction and we can date the sage's advice with relative precision, such an approach is understandable. (5) Certain similarities between the two sapiential texts have fueled the comparison and tendency to locate *4QInstruction* during the pre-Maccabean era. Like the author of *4QInstruction*, the Jewish sage Ben Sira addresses such matters as borrowing and lending, filial piety, and the shadow of death in the human experience. In addition, common terms and linguistic constructs with *Sirach* have influenced the placement of *4QInstruction* during this period.

Since the publication of *4QInstruction*, several commentators have considered this relationship, but the recent critical edition by J.-S. Rey makes the most forceful case for an overlapping date and a "dialogue" between the two sapiential works. (6) Rey cites common terminology, including the following interdictory formula: אַל-לַפְּנֵי תַקְטֵל ("Do not do this... lest...") (19 times in *4QInstruction* 18 times in *Ben Sira*). (7) He also notes a similar application of the fifth commandment (*Exod* 20:12; *Deut* 5:16) in *4Q416* 2 iii 15-19 and *Sir* 3:1-16. According to Rey's detailed, innovative analysis, the line between honoring one's parents and honoring God is unmistakably traced in both texts. (8) Rey is careful to distinguish the social milieu of *4QInstruction* from the more elite provenance of *Ben Sira*, and he notes the absence of an eschatological framework in the latter text. Even with divergent social locations and perspectives on the afterlife, he suggests a dialogue between the two works on these and other

responsible for its content. The common abbreviation *Sir* will precede chapter and verse citations, and *Sirach* will be used as an alternative title for the book.

(5) Based on the reference to Ptolemy VII Euergetes in the grandson's prologue and the approximate length of two generations, the period in which Ben Sira had his career and wrote this instruction (early second century B.C.E.) is not in dispute. The *Wisdom of Ben Sira* is presented as the product of a lengthy career and does not indicate an awareness of the persecutions under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.E.). The praise of Simon II (219-196 B.C.E.) in *Sir* 50:1-21 suggests that Ben Sira and this high priest were at least near contemporaries, although these words could have been written after Simon's death. See J.J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 23.

(6) For earlier studies, see D.G. Harrington, "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2002), 263-75; M.J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*; B.G. Wright, "The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001* (ed. J.J. Collins et al.; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 101-25.

(7) Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 18.

(8) Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 183-226.

issues. When assessing the thematic similarities and the common vocabulary in *Ben Sira* and *4QInstruction*, he concludes “Si l’on considère également l’argument linguistique, il apparaît clairement qu’ils doivent être plus ou moins contemporains.” (9)

The relationship between *4QInstruction* and *Ben Sira* merits careful study, and there are enough parallels to demonstrate certain mutual interests and *roughly* similar periods of composition. The commonalities between the two sapiential texts allow us to identify important developments in the Second Temple wisdom tradition, and this factor alone makes the inquiry worthwhile. For example, the common application of the *Genesis* creation stories in these two texts points to an innovative move within sapiential circles during this period that is absent from earlier instructions like *Proverbs*.

Yet the hypothesis of a dialogue is inconclusive at best, and it is far from clear that *4QInstruction* dates from the same period as *Ben Sira*. A thematic and linguistic comparison indicates similarities, but also disparate viewpoints, generic conventions, and audiences. Since they come from such different rungs on the socioeconomic ladder, it is implausible to suppose a rivalry or even an ongoing conversation between *Ben Sira* and those responsible for *4QInstruction*. Moreover, the linguistic commonalities cited by Rey do not necessitate an identical period for the two texts, and in some cases the link is not as strong as his recent edition suggests. Terminological affinities between *4QInstruction* and other documents from the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus are more compelling and might point to a later date for this fragmentary sapiential work. The following discussion will examine these texts more closely in order to test the relationship between the two documents. Our analysis will highlight significant parallels, but it will also demonstrate divergent perspectives on a host of matters, including the acquisition of knowledge, eschatology, and the acceptability of speculative wisdom. This inquiry will show that comparative study between the texts is fruitful, but the differences remain considerable and point to the diversity of the wisdom tradition during this period.

### Social Location

In terms of background, commentators have identified *Ben Sira* as a scribal-sage and a member of the “retainer” class, meaning that he served among the elite. (10) The author’s discourse reflects this

(9) Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 334.

(10) B.G. Wright, “‘Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest’: *Ben Sira* as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood,” in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28-31 July 1996, Soesterberg*,

social location: he refers to himself as a “scribe” (סופר/γραμματεύς) in *Sir* 38:24. Ben Sira’s optimistic assessment of this profession suggests a similar role for his pupils, who will themselves teach wealthy benefactors and depend on good relationships with the upper classes. As he educated future scribes, Ben Sira had to cultivate a careful relationship with powerful individuals, including priests, in order to maintain his livelihood. In this pursuit, he lauds the opportunities of his own profession: “Do not slight the discourse of the sages, but busy yourself with their maxims; because from them you will learn discipline and how to serve princes” (*Sir* 8:8). The use of לַהֲתִיב (“to serve”) in this verse implies a subservient role for scribal-sages, but one that included frequent interactions with the elite and the perks that go with these associations. Ben Sira explains to his charges their unique potential: other occupations do not afford one the opportunity to “attain eminence in the public assembly” or “expound discipline or judgment” (*Sir* 38:33).

With regard to those below him in the social hierarchy, the message in *Sirach* is mixed. On the one hand, the sage enjoins his audience to avoid corruption and care for the poor, and he repeatedly emphasizes the importance of almsgiving (*Sir* 3:30; 7:10; 12:3; 17:22; 29:8, 12; 35:4; 40:17, 24). He also criticizes aspects of the mercantile professions, most notably the temptation to defraud others in the endless pursuit of profit (*Sir* 26:29-27:2). (11) Despite these bold injunctions regarding the pitfalls of buying and selling, his tone towards the non-scribal classes can be patronizing. He belittles manual labor, even as he recognizes its necessity for the functioning of an orderly society. In comparing the opportunities of the scribe with other professions, he asks, “How can one become wise who handles the plow, and who glories in the shaft of a goad, who drives oxen and is occupied with their work, and whose talk is about bulls?” (*Sir* 38:25).

*Netherlands* (BZAW 255; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 195-96, detects a hierarchical perspective in *Ben Sira*, where the author is part of the “retainer class,” consisting of educated “scribe-sages” who served the priestly elite and other powerful individuals, including Greek officials. See also R. Horsley and P. Tiller, “Ben Sira and the Sociology of the Second Temple,” in *Second Temple Studies III: Studies in Politics, Class, and Material Culture* (JSOTSup 340; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 74-108.

(11) On the concern for the poor in this text, see B.G. Wright and C.V. Camp, “‘Who Has Been Tested by Gold and Found Perfect?’: Ben Sira’s Discourse of Riches and Poverty,” *Hen* 23 (2001): 153-74; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 29-33. The incisive critique is remarkable for someone in Ben Sira’s position, especially since he served the elite.

In contrast to Ben Sira's advice to scribal-sages, the addressees of *4QInstruction* are not part of the retainer class, and their financial status seems to be much more precarious. Significantly, the root עשר never appears in *4QInstruction*, and the author does not advise his listeners on how to treat those on the margins. Rather, the audience for this text seems to be poor themselves. This sapiential document contains numerous warnings regarding debt, standing surety for someone, and poverty terms such as מחסור. Many of the extant fragments suggest that the addressees of *4QInstruction* require good judgment in order to satisfy basic requirements. For example, "Do not reach for what is beyond the range of your power, lest you stumble, and your disgrace becomes exceeding[ly] great. [Do not sell] your soul for money" (*4Q416* 2 ii 15-17). (12) Additional passages reflect hardship and the need for business acumen: "And you, when you lack food, [br]ing your lack and your surplus [together; wh]en you have surplus, bring (it) to his place of business, and take your portion from him, and do not take any mor[e]" (*4Q417* 2 i 17-18). (13) Direct advice of this type to struggling persons never appears in *Ben Sira*.

For these individuals teetering between self-sufficiency and penury, the fragments of *4QInstruction* point to an agrarian background for certain recipients of the advice. For example, "observe the fixed times of the summer, and gather your produce at its time" (*4Q423* 5 5). In addition, the reference to "your basket" (ומטנאכה) in *4Q418* 126 ii 12 also reflects an agricultural setting. (14) Subsistence farmers in most contexts face the chronic anxiety of a potentially bad harvest and the onset of debt. In this particular document, the addressee is told to remain alert to his self-interest and the threat of immediate peril, while not taking more than he needs: "Be an advocate for your own (business) interests" (*4Q417* 2 i 12, translation mine). In a socioeconomic context where the audience members are struggling, the *raz nihyeh* and the promise it brings have a mitigating effect on current difficulties: "[Consider the *raz*] *nihyeh* and grasp the birth-times of

(12) C.M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 182-84, argues persuasively that much of this fragment (*4Q416* 2 ii) addresses a situation of debt-bondage.

(13) On the proper translation for these lines, see E.J.C. Tigchelaar, "הבא ביהד" in *4QInstruction* (*4Q418* 64 + 199 + 66 par *4Q417* 1 i 17-19) and the Height of the Columns of *4Q418*," *RevQ* 18 (1998): 589-93. This advice refers to prudent business transactions and not to the יחד of the rule books. For the translation "his place of business," see M.J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VTSup 116; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 55 n. 184. The subject matter is the buying and selling of goods with another individual.

(14) Cf. *4Q418* 103 ii and the apparent allusion to mixing crops.

salvation, and know who will inherit glory and t[oi]” (4Q417 2 i 10-11). The largely urban advice in *Sirach* does not reflect such a setting, nor does the more elite sage present an eschatological framework for his maxims (see below).

4QInstruction has a refrain that underscores the addressee’s difficult situation: “You are poor.” (15) Contrary to certain arguments about this declaration, which is unique in Second Temple instructions, the “you are poor” refrain is not symbolic or metaphorical, but an acknowledgment of actual financial challenges. (16) Even if most occurrences of this phrase are clustered in one extant column, the specificity about economic matters throughout 4QInstruction suggests a situation of real poverty for many recipients of this advice. (17) For example, a person in need (מחסור) can expect to find an unsympathetic, “tight-fisted” lender when seeking to provide for his family (4Q417 2 i 21-24). (18) Such a warning indicates concrete scenarios and not spiritual poverty.

Much advice in this text counsels the “poor” addressees of 4QInstruction about how to avoid destitution, including repeated warnings against going surety for someone. Clear prohibitions concerning the practice appear in 4Q415 8 2 (אל תערב) and 4Q418 88 3. The text of 4Q416 2 ii 4-6 is fragmentary, but the subject matter also seems to be

(15) Statements of this type in 4QInstruction use אבין and רש/רש. See 4Q415 6 2; 4Q416 2 ii 20; 4Q416 2 iii 2, 8, 12, 19; 4Q418 177 5.

(16) B.G. Wold, “Metaphorical Poverty in ‘Musar le Mevin’,” *JJS* 58 (2007), 149, argues that much of the poverty language in 4QInstruction is symbolic and that the author conveys the inferiority of human beings in relation to the angels (i.e., humanity lacks the spiritual wealth of angels). In support of this argument, Wold points to the cluster of “you are poor” refrains before the possible allusion to angels (referred to as נדיבים) in 4Q416 2 iii 11. In contrast, Wright, “The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature,” 112, claims that references to the addressee’s poverty should for the most part be taken as actual descriptions. The latter position is more persuasive: even though some of the economic vocabulary in 4QInstruction is symbolic and eschatological (e.g., “an inheritance of glory” [יבנחלת כבוד] in 4Q416 2 iii 11-12), this does not negate the many references to difficult circumstances throughout the text.

(17) D.F. Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction* (Gorgias Dissertations, Near Eastern Studies 3; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2004), 160-209, catalogues the financial references in the extant fragments.

(18) With regard to the rationale behind this refrain, it is reasonable to ask why the author of this text would repeatedly remind listeners of their obvious predicament. For those facing the possibility of debt-slavery, this refrain might serve as pointed motivation for diligence and prudence (i.e., since “you are poor,” extra caution is in order - see 4Q416 2 iii 12-13). The need for pragmatism is a common topic in earlier sapiential texts (e.g., *Prov* 21:5), and the acute circumstances for the audience of 4QInstruction make any financial advice even more important.



surety: “For the purse of your treasure/s/ [you] have ha[n]ded over to your creditor on account of your neighbors]; (in so doing) you [have given] your life. Quickly give what is his and take your purse back.” (19) In these examples, especially *4Q416* 2 ii 4-6, the advice reflects the pragmatic approach found in *Prov* 6:1-5 and related passages (*Prov* 11:15; 17:18; 20:16). For the struggling addresses of *4QInstruction*, risky loan guarantees might lead to even more precarious circumstances, especially when a person has little collateral. Therefore, one should avoid the practice of surety.

*Sirach*, on the other hand, contains a cautious endorsement of surety in a manner that differs from both *Proverbs* and *4QInstruction*. The clearest passage on the topic is *Sir* 29:14-20. Like *4QInstruction*, *Ben Sira* refers to surety as an endeavor that risks the life of a guarantor (*Sir* 29:15; cf. *Deut* 24:6). (20) The sage recognizes the dangers of the practice: “Being surety has ruined many who are prosperous, and has tossed them about like waves of the sea it has driven the influential into exile, and they have wandered among foreign nations” (*Sir* 29:18). Yet he urges his listeners to become a guarantor if at all possible: “Assist your neighbor to the best of your ability, but be careful not to fall yourself” (*Sir* 29:20). In this passage, Ben Sira concerns himself with how those “who are prosperous” respond to financial inequality; he does not address persons with more limited resources.

The discrepancy with *4QInstruction* on this point has been recognized by many scholars, including Rey. (21) If the difference is granted, then it becomes less likely to suppose a dialogue between the two texts, since *Sirach* reflects no direct interest in the financial situation of individuals like the *mevin* of *4QInstruction*. Nor can we posit similar periods of composition based on this theme, since surety remains a common topic in Jewish instructions throughout the Second Temple period (and earlier).

It is also noteworthy that the author of *4QInstruction* does not vilify material assets, nor does he critique those who are in positions of economic power. In the usual mold of the ancient Near Eastern wisdom tradition, this sapiential text lifts up financial holdings as a gift from God that persons should enjoy with gratitude (e.g., *4Q417* 2 i 19-20). As long as an individual does not hoard resources or defraud his neighbor, he can seek financial security (*4Q416* 2 ii 17-20). In this respect, class conflict is not a theme in the extant fragments, and this

(19) This translation follows the transcription in *DJD* 34, reading תן אשר לו וקח in lines 5-6 of the fragment.

(20) See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 141.

(21) Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 107, 334.



sapiential document urges listeners to make a living for themselves in difficult conditions. 4QInstruction in fact warns against assuming an intrinsic connection between poverty and election: “You are poor, (but) do not say, ‘I am poor, so I cannot seek knowledge.’ Bend your shoulder to all discipline” (4Q416 2 iii 12-13, translation mine). (22) Similarly, the addressee cannot use poverty as an excuse for poor behavior: “Honor your father in your poverty, and your mother in your steps” (4Q416 2 iii 15-16). The author of 4QInstruction concerns himself with those struggling persons who are privy to the enigmatic *raz nihyeh*, and the poverty language in the text indicates the circumstances of this particular audience. Larger social commentary is not part of the agenda in this text, and this factor makes it less likely that 4QInstruction is in conflict or even discussion with more elite instructions like *Ben Sira*. (23)

Both of these texts contain priestly language, and this raises the question of a cultic context for all or part of these instructions. (24) In 4QInstruction, one fragment in particular (4Q418 81) has led to speculation about the target audience and whether it includes priests. The statement in 4Q418 81 3 that “he is your portion and your inheritance among the sons of Adam” is an allusion to *Num* 18:20, where the Lord is the protector of Aaron and his priestly line. (25) Such language might indicate a direct address to a coterie of priests. (26) This is not necessarily the case, however: Elgvin argues persuasively that this section encourages *all* recipients of their share in a glorious inheritance. (27) The mixture of royal and cultic language in 4QInstruction

(22) This is yet another difference with *Ben Sira*, who emphasizes the leisure time for reflection afforded to the scribe. In contrast, the addressees of 4QInstruction have to focus their attention on daily living, but this does not excuse them from the requirements of meditating on the *raz nihyeh* and engaging in upright conduct.

(23) This is in contrast to the *Epistle of Enoch*, which labels the poor as righteous and castigates the wealthy (e.g., *1 En.* 94:8; cf. *Luke* 12:13-21). For a discussion of wealth and poverty in the former texts, see G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “Revisiting the Rich and Poor in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke,” *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 579-605.

(24) 4Q416 2 iv 7-10 and the discussion of vows (the husband/wife context does not seem to be priestly or Temple-related); 4Q423 3 4-5 and the consecration of the first-born. With regard to *Sirach*, see 7:29-31 and 34:21-35:13 and the praise of Aaron (45:6-22) and Simon (50:1-24).

(25) See *Num* 18:20 and the Lord’s statement to Aaron: “I am your share and your possession among the Israelites.”

(26) C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 178-79, argues that this line and all of 4Q418 81 represent an address to Aaronic priests, who were responsible for disseminating the message of 4QInstruction.

(27) T. Elgvin, “Priestly Sages? The Milieu of Origin of 4QInstruction and 4QMysteries,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea*

seems to be symbolic rather than literal and was probably not written by or for priests. (28) In these declarations, separation from the “fleshly spirit” category is encouraged (4Q418 81 2). Such a dualistic understanding resembles the contrast in 4Q417 1 i 13-18 between the elect audience of 4QInstruction, the “spiritual people,” and the “fleshly spirit,” who do not understand the difference between good and evil (cf. 4Q416 1). This type of language, including the use of priestly terms, encourages the audience for 4QInstruction to conduct themselves in a manner that befits their holy status. Yet this does not make the addressees priests. The Temple, Zion theology, and the responsibilities of cultic officials are not explicit concerns in this text. (29)

For his part, Ben Sira clearly acknowledges the important office of priest: “With all your soul fear the Lord, and revere his priests” (Sir 7:29). Drawing upon the Torah, the sage understands the requirement to share one’s holdings with the priests to be obligatory: “Fear the Lord and honor the priest, and give him his portion, as you have been commanded...” (Sir 7:31). (30) Such explicit devotion did not appear in earlier instructions like *Proverbs*, and this feature indicates Ben Sira’s devotion to the Torah. Moreover, as Wright and others have shown, Ben Sira needed the acceptance of the priestly authorities to pursue his scribal profession (contrast *Prov* 25:1 and the reliance on royal favor among earlier sages). Along with the moral requirement to support the priests, the inclusion of such language indicates the sage’s social position and need to cultivate relations with the powerful classes. (31) As a member of the retainer class, Ben Sira has to

*Scrolls, Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001* (ed. J.J. Collins et al.; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 67-89.

(28) Several statements in 4Q418 81 (e.g., line 4: “he has placed you as a holy of holies [over all] the earth”) imply special status for the elect audience and ultimately fellowship with the angels, rather than a priestly *Sitz im Leben*. The same type of elevation occurs in 4Q417 1 i (where the “fashioning” of אֲדָמָה [who represents Adam] is in the pattern of the “holy ones”). See J.J. Collins, “Sectarian Consciousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. L. LiDonnici and A. Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 190-91. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 236, argues that 4Q418 81 and 4Q415 1 ii-2 i are directed at priests, but other sections of the text have alternative target audiences.

(29) See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 12; Elgvin, “Priestly Sages,” 80-84.

(30) For the background of this reference, see *Exod* 29:27; *Lev* 7:31-34; *Deut* 18:3.

(31) H. Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Söfer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: Mohr, 1981),

concern himself with powerful benefactors, including the established priesthood, while the maxims of *4QInstruction* point to individuals more on the margins of the society who would not have come into regular contact with such persons.

When considering social location, much attention has focused on whether *4QInstruction* reflects a “sectarian” origin. This complex question can only receive brief attention here. (32) These fragments contain particularistic claims, including the idea of select knowledge for a righteous few (e.g., *4Q417* 1 i 13-18), and this is analogous to some of the rule books from the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus that reflect rigid group boundaries. Moreover, common terms appear in *4QInstruction* and other scrolls, including the *raz nihyeh* phrase. Yet the extant fragments of this sapiential text do not presume common ownership of property, refer to the *raz nihyeh* and not the Torah as the primary source of authority (contrast *IQS* 5:8), and target an assortment of individuals who can pursue their occupations and family affairs without submission to the rules of a formal body. Moreover, the advice in *4QInstruction* presupposes traditional households. Women are seen as integral to the family dynamic, the importance of marriage is affirmed, and in one passage the target of the advice is a female member of the household (*4Q415* 2 ii). (33) The instruction denotes an elect category of persons and promises its audience eternal glory, but the “sectarian” label implies a level of communal identity that is lacking in the extant fragments. Efforts to trace *4QInstruction* to the *yahad* or a related sect have obscured the level of autonomy granted to the recipients of this advice and the complete absence of communal structures. In assessing the various possibilities, the most plausible option is that *4QInstruction* originated within a more unstructured setting, prior to the formation of the *yahad*, and therefore “sectarian” is not an accurate label for this text. (34)

argues that Ben Sira was actually a priest, since he functioned as both a scribe and educator after the exile (analogous to Ezra). Stadelmann’s theory has met with little support.

(32) For a recent summary of *4QInstruction* and the sectarian question, including various scholarly positions on this topic, see Collins, “Sectarian Consciousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 186-92.

(33) On the importance of women in this text, see Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 49-53. Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 334, cites the importance of male-female relations in both *Ben Sira* and *4QInstruction* and the dominant role of the husband (*Sir* 9:1-9; 33:20; 47:19).

(34) Collins, “Sectarian Consciousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 192, calls the mindset in *4QInstruction* a “spiritual separatism that was not yet embodied in social action.”

Nevertheless, the mystery language in *4QInstruction* suggests a level of solidarity among its audience that is lacking in *Ben Sira*. While the more affluent sage undoubtedly had a loyal following among scribal trainees and other pupils, the content of *Sirach* reveals major differences from the language of spiritual election of *4QInstruction*. Those who placed their faith in the *raz nihyeh* almost certainly constituted a more loosely confederated group than the *yahad*, but their devotion to this mystery concept indicates a communal identity that differs from the more elite provenance of *Ben Sira*. The eschatological promises made to the addressees of *4QInstruction* may not reflect a formal group, but the text points to an exclusivist mentality based on the *raz nihyeh* that one does not find in *Sirach*.

### Terminological Similarities?

Perhaps, as Rey suggests, the two instructions can be situated during the same period and as dialogue partners because of common vocabulary that marks the specific timeframe of the early second century. Rey emphasizes the linguistic parallels between *Ben Sira* and *4QInstruction*, especially the fact that both make repeated use of the following interditory formula: ...אל-תקטל...פן ("Do not do *x*, lest *y* occur"). This is a noteworthy connection and perhaps indicates a literary convention of Second Temple instructions. Yet the same construct appears in earlier books like *Proverbs* (e.g., 20:13; 24:17-18), and therefore it cannot stand as a reliable marker for dating these sapiential texts.

As Rey and others have noted, *4QInstruction* and *Sirach* have clear language about filial piety. The most important passages in this regard are *4Q416* 2 iii 15-19 and *Sir* 3:1-16. Both texts are difficult, and so definitive conclusions are impossible. The critical line in *4QInstruction* is *4Q416* 2 iii 16, which the editors of *DJD* 34 transcribe as follows: כֹּאב לְאִישׁ כֵּן אֲבִיהָּ וְכֹאדָנִים לְגִבּוֹר כֵּן אִמּוֹ. In this line, כֹּאב should probably be substituted with כֹּאֵל (based on *4Q418* 9 17). The declaration can then be translated, "For as God (כֹּאֵל) is to a person, so his father, and as the Lord (כֹּאדָנִים) is to a person, so his mother." (35) The sapiential author clearly draws an analogy between God's dominion over the individual and the authority of parents over their children.

(35) See *DJD* 34, 120-21. The reading "like the Father" is possible, but improbable. Strugnell and Harrington's understanding of כֹּאדָנִים as a reference to God (rather than "masters") is convincing, especially since this construction parallels כֹּאֵל. Cf. Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 185-86.

In his extended discourse on this topic (3:1-16), Ben Sira also impresses upon his pupils the need to honor both parents. The language of 3:6-7 is significant for present purposes. Only a portion of the Hebrew is extant in MS A: מכבד אמו. Based on Syr. (and *Prov* 11:17), many commentators restore v. 6 as follows: מכבד אב יאריכו ימיו וגומל על אלהים מכבד אמו (“The one who respects his father will have lengthy days, and the one who honors his mother obeys God”). (36) Gk. II for 3:7a is ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον τιμήσει πατέρα (“The one who fears the Lord honors his father”). In the latter half of the verse (3:7b), Segal’s reconstruction contains a form that is identical to 4Q416 2 iii 16: וכאדנים יכבד ילדיו (“he will serve his parents like masters”). This is based on καὶ ὡς δεσπότης δουλεύσει ἐν τοῖς γεννήσασιν αὐτόν. According to Rey, the vocabulary in *Sir* 3:7 is significant, especially the sequence of κύριον and ὡς δεσπότης: “Elle correspond littéralement à la succession de אֵל et כאדנים en 4Q416 2 iii 16.” (37)

This is an interesting suggestion, and it is beyond dispute that 4QInstruction and Ben Sira draw upon *Exod* 20:12 and *Deut* 5:16 to emphasize respect for both parents. (38) Based on the Decalogue and sayings in *Proverbs* that emphasize loyalty to one’s mother and father (e.g., *Prov* 23:22), these two instructions cite a familiar theme in Jewish Wisdom. Yet Ben Sira never directly equates a child’s parents with the Deity in the manner of 4QInstruction: δεσπότης in 3:7 almost certainly refers to human “masters” and not to God. Ben Sira is not drawing a precise parallel between the God-individual relationship and the parent-child one through the כ preposition, as we find with 4QInstruction. The two sapiential works are working from the same biblical texts, but making somewhat different points about filial piety. Moreover, the lack of extant Hebrew for *Sir* 3:6-7 prevents a full understanding of the passage in any case. The text of 4Q416 2 iii 15-19 is also fragmentary. Evidence of a direct literary relationship or even the same assertion is lacking.

When considering the vocabulary in these texts, one can also cite major terminological differences between Ben Sira and 4QInstruction. The text from the Scrolls corpus contains numerous examples of a command preceding the conjunction ואז, followed by a verb describing

(36) M.H. Segal, *Sēper ben-Sirā’ haššālēm* (4th ed.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1997). Gk. for *Sir* 3:6 reads as follows: ὁ δοξάζων πατέρα μακροημερεύσει καὶ ὁ εἰσακούων κυρίου ἀναπαύσει μητέρα αὐτοῦ (“Those who respect their father will have long life, and those who obey the Lord provide comfort to their mother”).

(37) Rey, 4QInstruction: *sagesse et eschatologie*, 215.

(38) This section of 4QInstruction (4Q416 2 iii 15-19) contains the imperatival form of כבד in lines 15 and 18.

the consequence of heeding (or not heeding) the advice (27 occurrences). (39) For example, “[day and night meditate on the *ra*]z *nihyeh* ... then you will know truth and injustice” (4Q417 1 i 6). In contrast, this construct never appears in the extant Hebrew of *Ben Sira*. Such a distinction does not prove or disprove that these two texts were contemporaneous, but it underscores the difficulty of situating these two works based on linguistic features such as this one or the ... אל־תקטל פן construct cited by Rey.

In terms of vocabulary, 4QInstruction more closely resembles the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus of which it is a part. For example, parallels between the *Hodayot* and 4QInstruction are well-documented. (40) Linguistic overlaps demonstrate a relationship between some of the hymns and 4QInstruction. (41) The phrase יכבדו איש מרעהו (“according to their knowledge they are honored, each one more than his neighbor,”) occurs in IQH<sup>a</sup> 18:29-30 and 4Q418 55 10. Pivotal terms such as “fleshly spirit” (רוח בשר) appear in both texts with a negative connotation (4Q416 1 12; 4Q417 1 i 17; IQH<sup>a</sup> 5:15). (42) 4QInstruction uses the language of “engraving” to describe divine control over the universe: “for engraved is that which is ordained (חרות מחוקק) by God” (4Q417 1 i 15). Immediately following this statement in 4QInstruction is a reference to a “book of remembrance” (וספר זכרון), an allusion to Mal 3:16. Similar imagery appears in IQH<sup>a</sup> 9:25-26: “Everything has been engraved (חקוק) before you with a stylus of remembrance (בחרת זכרון).” This same passage uses רזי פלא (“wondrous mysteries”) to describe God’s creation (IQH<sup>a</sup> 9:23), which is analogous to the mystery language in 4QInstruction. Such terminological links are more compelling than any connection with the language in *Ben Sira*.

(39) B. Nitzan, “The Ideological and Literary Unity of 4QInstruction and Its Authorship,” *DSD* 12 (2005), 260.

(40) See M.J. Goff, “Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the *Hodayot*,” *DSD* 11 (2003), 272-74, for a discussion of mystery language in the *Hodayot*.

(41) Column and line numbers for the *Hodayot* follow H. Stegemann, E. Schuller, and C. Newsom, *IQHodayot<sup>a</sup>: With Incorporation of IQHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>a-f</sup>* (DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009). See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 203-7, for a list of parallels between these two texts. Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 24-28, also provides a useful table of terminological links.

(42) Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 206, points out that these are the only two texts to contain this phrase. This same column from the *Hodayot* contains the phrase “mysteries of your insight” (5:30), another parallel with 4QInstruction. For more on the significance of “fleshly spirit” in this text, see the important discussion in J. Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peters, 2002), 367-404.



Another interesting and largely unnoticed parallel occurs in *IQH*<sup>a</sup> 14:32-33, which is an eschatological scene describing judgment: “All the sons of his tr[ru]th will awaken (יִעֹרְרוּ), to destroy [the sons of] wickedness, and all the sons of guilt will no longer exist” (לֹא יִהְיוּ עוֹד). A fragment from *4QInstruction*, 4Q418 69 ii, includes similar vocabulary to depict a moment of judgment: “The dark places will shriek against your pleadings, and all who exist forever, who seek the truth, will arise (יִעֹרְרוּ) to judge y[ou]. Then all the foolish of heart will be annihilated, and the sons of iniquity will not be found anymore (לֹא יִמְצְאוּ עוֹד)” (lines 6-8). Whether this language refers to resurrection is beyond the scope of the present discussion. (43) What is pertinent here is that *4QInstruction* and the *Hodayot* utilize similar vocabulary (e.g., עוֹר) to convey an eschatological moment in which truth will be uncovered and the wicked will face judgment. We are not insisting on a direct literary relationship between these passages (though this is certainly possible), but rather attempting to show that the terminological connections between these two texts are stronger than any link between *4QInstruction* and *Ben Sira*. Most commentators assume that the *Hodayot* are a product of the Dead Sea sect, and based on these and other parallels, it is probable that *4QInstruction* served as a source for the authors of some of these hymns. (44)

*4QInstruction* and the Treatise on the Two Spirits (*IQS* 3:13-4:26) also have a number of common features, including judgment language. (45) For example, both texts contain “visitation” (פְּקוּדָה) with an eschatological connotation and the epithet “God of knowledge” (אֵל הַדַּעוֹת). (46) In addition, כּוֹל קְצֵי עוֹלָם (or עוֹלָמִים) (“all periods of eternity”) occurs in *4Q417* 1 i 7 and twice in the Treatise (*IQS* 4:16, 25-26). Both texts use מַחֲשַׁבֶּת to describe God’s plan for the creation. (47) On the thematic level, *4QInstruction* and the Treatise

(43) See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 177-79; S.L. Adams, *Wisdom in Transition: Act and Consequence in Second Temple Instructions* (JSJSup 125; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 223-24, for a review of the debate. This scene in *4Q418* 69 ii relates to emulating the heavenly host: the righteous individual is made aware of a final judgment in which angels will be involved in the process. For more on this fragment and the presentation of humanity and the angels in *4Q416* 69 ii, see also F. García Martínez, “Marginalia on *4QInstruction*,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 24-37.

(44) On the *Sitz im Leben* for the *Hodayot*, see Goff, “Reading Wisdom at Qumran,” 269-72.

(45) Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 194-203; cf. A. Lange, *Weishheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 128-30.

(46) The phrase “God of knowledge” appears in *IQS* 3:15 and multiple times in *4QInstruction*, *Mysteries*, and the *Hodayot*. See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 197.

(47) Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 128, 151, 179, 185, 219; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 196.

present a dualistic understanding of the created order. Humanity is divided into two camps: one group, by virtue of its elect status and righteous behavior, “inherits” eternal life, while the other is sentenced to everlasting torment. (48)

The cumulative effect of these similarities demonstrates a direct literary relationship and perhaps a common background, and this raises the issue of chronology. The Treatise depicts a more elaborate dualism, including light-darkness imagery, to convey the two types of individual in the world. The “spiritual people”/“fleshly spirit” dichotomy of *4QInstruction* is less developed than the “sons of light”/“sons of darkness” imagery in the Treatise. The former text lacks the scene of a cosmic, mythological struggle (e.g., the reference to a “prince” in *IQS* 3:20). For this reason, it is more likely that the description of two groups in *4Q417* 1 i 13-18 preceded the more intricate portrait in *IQS* 3:13-4:26, as Lange and others have argued. (49) In any case, the connection between the Treatise and *4QInstruction* is far more compelling than any link with *Ben Sira*.

When examining all of these terminological issues, it becomes clear that the commonalities between *4QInstruction* and other documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus exceed any proposed link with *Ben Sira*. To take just one more example, *4QInstruction* contains numerous occurrences of the *hitpa’el* of הלך (36 total), usually with an ethical connotation (e.g., *4Q417* 1 i 12: “... while he walks [התהלכו] [per]fect[ly in all] his [d]eeds”). This form denotes proper conduct for the addressee, and it also appears frequently in *CD* and *IQS* with the same basic meaning. For example, the Treatise mentions categories of humanity based on truth and injustice. In one path (or “spirit”) all persons “walk” (יתהלכו: *IQS* 3:13-18). In contrast, this *hitpa’el* form appears just three times in *Sirach*, and only one of these occurrences relates to proper conduct. (50) When one considers the fact that *Ben Sira* does not contain the discourse of apocalyptic eschatology, the terminological links between the two texts become even less pronounced (see below). Consequently, it does not follow that the author of *4QInstruction* and *Ben Sira* necessarily date from the same

(48) *IQS* 3:14-26; *4Q417* 1 i 13-18.

(49) Lange, *Weishheit und Prädestination*, 130; idem, “Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995), 348, calls the deterministic understanding in the Treatise a logical progression from the same circles responsible for *4QInstruction*.

(50) *Sir* 3:17 contains the imperatival form: “My child, perform (התהלך) your tasks with humility.” *Sir* 9:13 describes the act of traversing an area, a very common usage of this form: “... you are walking (תתהלך) on city battlements.” In *Sir* 44:16, the form occurs in the section describing Enoch “walking (והתהלך) with the Lord” (based on *Gen* 5:24).



period, based on linguistic parallels. Terminological evidence points instead to the need for ongoing analysis of the language and ideas in 4QInstruction with the undisputed documents of the *yahad*.

## Use of Genesis Creation Stories

One of the more significant commonalities between these two texts is the use of the *Genesis* creation accounts to explain God's relationship with humanity. Both *Ben Sira* and 4QInstruction employ these narratives to differentiate categories of people in the world, and in key passages there is a dualistic understanding of the created order. In 4QInstruction, the interpretation of Genesis includes 4Q417 1 i 13-18, the so-called "vision of Hagu" pericope. For present purposes, the most important lines are 15-18:

- |  |  |    |
|--|--|----|
|  | כי חרות מחוקק לאל על כול ע[ולות] בני שות וספר זכרון כתוב לפניו     | 15 |
|  | לשמרי דברו והוא חזק הנהגה לספר זכרון וינחילנו לאנוש עם ע" רוח כ[ר] | 16 |
|  | כתבנית קדושים יצרו ועוד לוא נתן הגה לרוח בשר כי לא ידע בין         | 17 |
|  | ט[ב] לרע כמשפט [ר]וח[ו] vacat[ ]                                   | 18 |
- 15 For engraved is that which has been ordained by God against all the in[iquities] of the children of Sheth. And written in His presence is a book of memorial
- 16 for those who keep His word. And it is the vision of meditation/Hagu on a book of memorial. And He gave it as an inheritance to אנוש along with a spiritual people,
- 17 s[inc]e his/their inclination is in accordance with the image of the holy ones. But meditation/Hagu has still not been given to the fleshly spirit, for it did not know the difference between
- 18 [go]od and evil according to the judgment of its [sp]irit.

There are several text-critical problems in this passage, which have been addressed at length in other studies. (51) Of particular interest here is the reference to the "spiritual people," the "fleshly spirit," and אנוש to describe the bestowal of knowledge upon the elect category and the lack of discernment among non-elect persons. In seeking to understand this presentation, the connotation of אנוש has remained a contentious point in the study of 4QInstruction. Does it refer to the antediluvian Enosh (*Gen* 4:26), or is it an indicator of humanity at large? (52) The former is unlikely, especially since other texts from

(51) For a discussion of these difficulties, such as the reference point for בני שות, see Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 84-88; Adams, *Wisdom in Transition*, 257-61.

(52) For the interpretation that this refers to the antediluvian figure, see Lange,

this period do not lift up Enosh as an isolated example of righteousness or the recipient of divine revelation. Neither can it signify all of humanity, since the ethical dualism of *4QInstruction* precludes the bestowal of discernment to every person. Elsewhere in the extant fragments, the “fleshly spirit” category is viewed negatively (*4Q416* 1 12; *4Q418* 81 1-2). Moreover, *ועוד לוא* in *4Q417* 1 i 17 appears to mean “still” or “not yet,” rather than “no more.” In *4QInstruction*, God has withheld discernment from the non-elect category since creation, and so the suggestion of *אנוש* as all of humanity does not fit the theology of the text. (53)

The most likely possibility is that *אנוש* in this fragment represents the biblical Adam and therefore a noteworthy usage of *Genesis* 2-3. (54) In support of this interpretation is the fact that the Treatise on the Two Spirits uses the term in a similar manner, also drawing upon *Genesis*: “He created man (*אנוש*) to rule the world” (*IQS* 3:17). Later in the Treatise, the chosen group receives the “wisdom of the sons of heaven” in order to achieve the “glory of Adam” (*IQS* 4:22-23). The Treatise presents a more developed framework than *4QInstruction*, but the common application of the *Genesis* story suggests Adam as the reference point for *אנוש* in both places. Other texts from this period elevate the first human in a similar manner, including *Jubilees*. (55) *4Instruction* seems to be an early example of this interpretive move, even if the distinctions between the righteous and unrighteous categories and how they relate to Adam are not as explicit as in other texts. This is another indicator that the Treatise draws upon *4QInstruction* and not vice-versa.

*Weisheit und Prädestination*, 87; G.J. Brooke “Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger BETL 159; Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 2002), 165. With regard to *אנוש* as all of humanity, see B. G. Wold, *Women, Men, and Angels: The Qumran Document Musar leMevin and Its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 135-41, who maintains that the “vision of Hagu” was originally given to everyone (i.e., *אנוש*), but then taken away from the “fleshly spirit” category.

(53) 2 *Chr* 20:33 contains a similar usage of *ועוד לוא* with the meaning “not yet.” Wold, *Women, Men, and Angels*, 139, interprets *לוא* as follows: “but no more does he give Haguy to a spirit of flesh.” This is untenable, based on the reasons cited above.

(54) J.J. Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 615-18.

(55) Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 616-17, points to later depictions of Adam’s formation in the image of the angels (e.g., *Gen R.* 21:5). Cf. Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 97, who cites a passage from *Jubilees* (3:15) in which Adam receives instruction from the angels in the garden.

In addressing human behavior, the distinct creation stories in *Genesis* 1-3 assist the author of 4QInstruction in demarcating two categories, the “spiritual people” and the “fleshly spirit.” In the second creation account, the male figure is entirely mortal, made from the “dust of the ground” (*Gen* 2:7), and he is not wise. The “fleshly spirit” individuals of 4QInstruction, with their inability to understand the difference between good and evil (*Gen* 3:5), represent and in a sense embody this figure. On the other side, the righteous addressees of 4QInstruction are part of the “spiritual people.” Through their access to the “vision of Hagu” and special endowment at creation (e.g., כתבנית קדושים), these “spiritual people” can hope for the same path to discernment that Adam (אנוש) enjoyed. This second group then relates to the first creation story. (56) In this respect, 4QInstruction and the Treatise demonstrate that *Genesis* 1-3 had become an important source for highlighting the duality between favored and unfavored persons during the late Second Temple period. The distinct creation accounts provided the author of 4QInstruction with a template for ethical dualism. A similar, more developed bifurcation also occurs in the writings of Philo. (57)

With regard to the more elite sage, Ben Sira’s use of the *Genesis* narratives is also well-established, as he offers a complex understanding of determinism and free will. In one of the earliest known allusions to the creation accounts, this sage declares that God “created humankind (האדם) in the beginning, and he left them in the power of their own free choice (ביד יצור)” (*Sir* 15:14). Despite its negative connotation in certain biblical passages (e.g., the “evil inclination” in *Gen* 6:5; 8:21), יצר seems to designate an individual’s natural disposition in *Sirach*. (58) Within this instruction, יצר denotes each person’s ability to make the right choices, or at least avoid the wrong ones. In

(56) Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 612-14, understands כתבנית קדושים as a paraphrase of בעלם אלהים (*Gen* 1:27), and he takes אלהים in this verse to be a reference to angelic beings rather than God. If this interpretation is correct, the usage of *Genesis* in 4QInstruction becomes even more pronounced.

(57) Philo reads the accounts in *Genesis* as indicative of a double creation (*Opif.* 134-35). While his philosophical understanding is different from 4QInstruction and the Treatise, the fact that many authors, including Ben Sira, used these stories is a major indicator of their importance. We should also note a fragmentary passage from 4QInstruction that uses the terminology of the Eden story: “He set you in charge of it to till it and guard it” (4Q423 1 2). There is language in this fragment about “[rejecting] the evil and knowing the good” (line 7), and this is similar to the description of two choices in *Sirach* 17.

(58) J. Hadot, Jean, *Penchant Mauvais et Volonté Libre dans la Sagesse de Ben Sira (L’Ecclésiastique)* (Brussels: University Press, 1970), 13, warns against associating the developed rabbinic understanding of יצר too closely with an instruction like *Sirach* that is much earlier and less sophisticated on this point.

this section of *Ben Sira*, we do not find a doctrine of free will so much as encouragement to take responsibility for one's actions, since God has given humanity the capacity to make the correct decisions. The point about responsibility is underscored in this section: "Do not say, 'It was the Lord's doing that I fell away'; for he does not do what he hates" (*Sir* 15:11).

This view of human discernment stems in part from Ben Sira's innovative reading of the accounts from *Genesis*: he understands the imparting of knowledge at creation to be an intentional act by God. In chapter 17, discernment is an essential gift rather than a forbidden fruit: "He (God) filled them with knowledge and understanding, and showed them good and evil" (*Sir* 17:7; cf. *Gen* 3:5). While drawing upon some of the same vocabulary as *4QInstruction* (e.g., טוב ורע), Ben Sira differs in his interpretation. The figure in *4QInstruction* who cannot distinguish between good and evil is not in the same category as the one whom the Creator fashioned according to the image of the holy ones. (59) These groups constitute two distinct classes, the negative "fleshly spirit" and the "spiritual people," who have eternal possibilities through their access to the *raz nihyeh*. *Sir* 17:7 does not reflect the same dualistic understanding. No person can attribute errant behavior to intrinsic deficiencies: if an individual's צר tilts in the wrong direction, he has strayed from the "fear of the Lord" and cannot blame God. (60)

Yet Ben Sira's discussion of creation and human accountability is not so consistent. The sage does not resolve statements about Wisdom being created "with the faithful in the womb" (*Sir* 1:14) with contrary assertions about each person's ability to control their destiny through discipline (15:11). Statements like 1:14 suggest a divine decision to favor certain persons from birth, such that everything is pre-determined, and the wicked have no chance of success. Such a deterministic viewpoint would seem to contradict his other statements about the power of the human inclination to avert wrongdoing (e.g., 15:11). This tension is common in instructions from this period, including *4QInstruction*, which does not reconcile statements about the disclosure of the *raz nihyeh* to an elect few (*4Q418* 184 2) and the need for ongoing attentiveness in the pursuit of discernment (e.g., *4Q417* 1 i 6-13). (61)

(59) Collins, "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones," 616-17.

(60) *4QInstruction* is not completely deterministic, and the contrast between the two categories undoubtedly has an ethical component. The addressees should conduct themselves uprightly if they wish to remain in the "spiritual people" category.

(61) See C. Werman, "What is the *Book of Hagu*?" in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Sixth Interna-*

The famous presentation of the “pairs” in *Sir* 33:7-15, with its dualistic understanding of the created order, complicates Ben Sira’s framework even further:

- 10 All human beings come from the ground, and humankind was created out of the dust.
- 11 In the fullness of his knowledge the Lord distinguished them and appointed their different ways.
- 12 Some he blessed and exalted, and some he made holy and brought near to himself; but some he cursed and brought low, and turned them out of their place.
- 13 Like clay in the hand of the potter, to be molded as he pleases, so all are in the hand of their Maker, to be given whatever he decides.
- 14 Good is the opposite of evil, and life the opposite of death; so the sinner is the opposite of the godly.
- 15 Look at all the works of the Most High; they come in pairs, one the opposite of the other.

According to this passage, human destiny and in fact the whole of creation lie “in the hand of the potter, to be molded as he pleases,” (*Sir* 33:13), and everything comes in necessary opposites. God curses some human beings from the beginning (v. 12), and this appears to nullify any possibility for success among this category. The influence of Stoic ideas is probable here, and the sage once again relies on *Genesis* to explain his perspective (*Gen* 2:7 and creation out of the dust of the earth). (62) In a general sense, this dualistic presentation approximates the two categories of people in the “vision of Hagu” pericope from *4QInstruction* and the Treatise on the Two Spirits.

Yet *Sir* 33:7-15 does not necessarily represent the sage’s final answer to the theodicy question, especially since the pairs do not seem to represent autonomous, independent agents. Other sections of the instruction, such as the hymn in *Sir* 39:12-35, have a monistic framework, where everything obeys God’s plan, and the wicked receive a more severe punishment (cf. *Sir* 40:8-9). (63) When reading this instruction, it becomes apparent that the author tries out different solutions to the existence of evil and his belief in an omniscient deity, and he tailors his argumentation to whatever topic he is

*tional Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May 2001* (ed. J.J. Collins et al.; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125-40.

(62) There is similar language in a passage attributed to Chrysippus (from Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 7.1.2-4, SVF 2.1169). See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 85.

(63) On *Sir* 39:12-35, see J. Liesen, Jan, *Full of Praise: An Exegetical Study of Sir 39,12-35* (JSJSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

addressing. (64) In this pursuit, Ben Sira repeatedly uses the *Genesis* stories to build his arguments about divine retribution, sin, and human responsibility. The dualistic understanding in *4QInstruction* is far more pronounced than what we find in *Sirach*.

When comparing the use of *Genesis* in these two sapiential works, it is significant that these texts rely on the creation narratives to address determinism, discernment, and the types of people in the world. These instructions do not always adhere closely to the *Genesis* accounts when addressing such fundamental issues: witness Ben Sira's omission of the fall in 17:7 and the use of separate creation stories in *4QInstruction* to differentiate the righteous and wicked categories in *4Q417* 1 i 13-18. Such creative interpretations of *Genesis* mark a major development in the Second Temple period (cf. *Jubilees* and Philo), especially in sapiential and apocalyptic texts. Both of these instructions are clearly part of the nascent tradition. This represents one of the more significant commonalities between the two texts, even if the usage of *Genesis* is not identical. (65) Earlier Wisdom books such as *Proverbs* had not wrestled with the creation stories in the same manner. Yet *Ben Sira* and *4QInstruction* show no indication of responding to or imitating one another in this regard. They utilized *Genesis* in different ways and for diverse ends. This important parallel does not necessarily indicate a dialogue or identical period of composition.

### The Search for Knowledge

A related point of comparison is the manner in which these texts describe the search for knowledge. In *4QInstruction*, the *raz nihyeh* represents the key to knowledge of God and earthly success. Within the ethical framework for this text, the esoteric mystery seems to replace Wisdom as the baseline concept for the enlightened individual. The Deity has "uncovered" many things, including the "entry of years and the exit of periods" to "those who understand the *raz nihyeh*" (*4Q418* 123 ii 2-4). For this and similar fragments, much scholarly attention has focused on whether the *raz nihyeh* relates to some sort of written work. Among the various options are the Torah, the *Book of Mysteries*, the "book of Hagu/meditation" in the *Damascus Document*, or the Treatise on the Two Spirits. (66) *4QInstruction*

(64) Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 95.

(65) Among the number of late Second Temple sources that utilize and in some cases radically reinterpret *Genesis* are *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* and Paul's use of the Adam story in *Rom* 5:12-21.

(66) This "book of Hagu/meditation" is mentioned three times in the *Damascus*

never uses the word תורה, and this possibility is therefore unlikely. Moreover, the lack of explicit connection between the Torah and the *raz nihyeh* differs sharply from Ben Sira's linkage of Wisdom and the Mosaic legislation. Yet the existence of some sort of esoteric document as an object of study is certainly possible in 4QInstruction. Other texts from this period, including *Daniel* and certain sections in the Enochic corpus, highlight the symbolic value of written works. (67)

It is possible that studying the *raz nihyeh* included mystical aspects: the "spiritual people" in 4QInstruction have special capacities for discernment that seem to derive from their access to "a book of memorial" (4Q417 1 i 16), and angels play a role in the judgment process (e.g., 4Q418 69 ii 7). A similar phenomenon occurs in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, where the protagonist gains insight through his access to visions, the heavenly court, and tablets (1 En. 93:1-2). We cannot clarify with certainty the elliptical content of 4QInstruction, but the *raz nihyeh* does seem to involve speculative inquiry for an elect set of individuals, with a strong eschatological and revelatory component. (68)

As previously mentioned, 4QInstruction reflects a complex relationship between revelation and the empirical learning that was a longstanding feature of Israel's wisdom tradition. On the one hand, this sapiential work highlights God's favor upon those who are the recipients of this advice: "he has opened insight for you, and he has given you authority over his treasure, and an ephah of truth he has entrusted" (e.g., 4Q418 81 9). Such passages, including fragments that mention the *raz nihyeh*, create boundaries between persons who are privy to God's revelatory truth and those who are not (e.g., 4Q418 123 ii 4). This language suggests foreordained status for certain individuals. (69) In other statements, however, diligent learning plays a role

*Document* (CD 10:6; 13:2; 14:8 [restored]) and in IQSa 1:7, which reads הָהִי. S.D. Fraade, "Hagu, Book of," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:327, argues that "Hagu" is an object of study and learning in all of these examples.

(67) Methuselah receives instruction from Enoch in the form of books (1 En. 82:1-4), and Daniel has information in sealed documents. There is also the "book of truth" in Dan 10:21.

(68) See most recently S.I. Thomas, *The 'Mysteries' of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Early Judaism and Its Literature 25; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 150-61, who highlights the importance of election in the various passages containing the *raz nihyeh* phrase.

(69) A. Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May 2001* (ed. J.J. Collins et al.; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 2-6, argues that 4QInstruction and many other documents from



in *4QInstruction*, with an emphasis on empirical epistemology. The *mevin* is supposed to “meditate upon” (הגה) the mystery and “study (it) continually (דורש תמיד)”: “And then you shall know truth and iniquity” (4Q417 1 i 6). Additional markers of this pedagogical emphasis include a reference to a *maskil* at the beginning of the composition, suggesting an educational context of some sort. (70) Persons who are the target of this advice must commit to a lifetime of learning: “And from all your teachers (משכילכה) get more understanding” (4Q418 81 17). The maxims on everyday matters such as lending and farming necessitate the type of empirical knowledge valued by the sages responsible for *Proverbs* and *Ben Sira*. Consequently, *4QInstruction* combines traditional advice with the language of spiritual election.

On this issue, *Ben Sira* adheres more closely than *4QInstruction* to longstanding modes of discourse, while incorporating Torah and criticizing mantic wisdom. (71) The sage advocates rigor and discipline in one’s course of study (e.g., *Sir* 39:1-11). At the end of his lengthy advice, he concludes, “Happy are those who concern themselves with these things (i.e., the content of the sage’s instruction), and those who lay them to heart will become wise” (*Sir* 50:28). In his advocacy of the tradition, Ben Sira rejects the speculative, mantic wisdom found in a corpus like *1 Enoch*. He opposes inquiries of this type: “Neither seek what is too difficult for you (נסתרות), nor investigate what is beyond your power. Reflect upon what you have been commanded, for what is hidden is not your concern” (*Sir* 3:21-22: contrast 4Q417 1 i 11-14, where the addressee receives “the secrets [נסתרי] of his [God’s] thought” in order to obtain “eternal glory”). Ben Sira’s pupils should commit themselves to study at the feet of a capable teacher (*Sir* 6:34-36), and their efforts must include engagement with the Torah. The sage advises his pupils to find intelligent friends, “... and let all your discussion be about the law of the Most High” (*Sir* 9:15).

this period privilege special revelation over a lifetime of accumulated knowledge. According to the argument, this is a break from the earlier model found in a text like *Proverbs* (e.g., 16:31: “Gray hair is a crown of glory; it is gained in a righteous life”).

(70) E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of *4QInstruction* (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels),” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger) BETL 159; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2002), 122-25, claims that *4QInstruction* might begin with משכיל in 4Q416 1, based on his reading of 4Q418 238. See also in the same volume C. Hempel, “The Qumran Sapiential Texts and the Rule Books,” 286-95, for a helpful survey of *maskil* references in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

(71) In addition, *4QInstruction* does not refer to the election of Israel in the manner of *Ben Sira*.



The content of the hymn to Wisdom in chapter 24 and Ben Sira's appeal to his role as successor to the prophets have led to speculation about his self-understanding. Perhaps the synthesis of traditional teaching and revelatory language in *Sirach* is closer to 4QInstruction than the current discussion is allowing. In the centerpiece of the book, the sage takes on the prophetic role and becomes a conduit of Wisdom and Torah. Ben Sira announces his self-assessment in this regard: "I will again pour out teaching like prophecy, and leave it to all future generations" (*Sir* 24:33; cf. 39:1). Not only does he take up the mantle of prophecy, but the sage also adopts certain forms from this literary genre. (72) Ben Sira claims divine inspiration for his teaching: like the prophets, the scribe is filled with "the spirit of understanding." (*Sir* 39:6), and "The Lord will direct his counsel and knowledge, as he meditates on his mysteries" (39:7). Such language suggests a degree of pneumatic inspiration for the content of this book, analogous to the prophets and certain constructs in 4QInstruction (e.g., 4Q418 81 9). (73) Ben Sira clearly regards his teaching as both faithful to the wisdom tradition and divinely inspired. He lauds the succession of Israel's servants in the lengthy Praise of the Ancestors in chapters 40-48, and as certain statements indicate, the sage considers his own teachings to reflect his access to Wisdom, whose "thoughts are more abundant than the sea, and her counsel deeper than the great abyss" (*Sir* 24:29).

Yet Ben Sira criticizes speculative practices, and he does not endorse mystical processes as an appropriate means of accessing divine truth. His opposition to mantic wisdom is a case in point (e.g., *Sir* 34:1-8 and the sage's basic skepticism about the interpretive possibilities for this type of inquiry). The sage's baseline model is the pursuit of מוסר ("discipline"), which one undertakes through the study of traditional maxims and now the Torah (e.g., *Sir* 1:26-27). While he does not limit God's ability to work in diverse and marvelous ways, the most effective means of success for humanity is tireless commitment to "fear of the Lord," rather than an esoteric mystery concept. In this regard, *Sirach* differs sharply from the presentation in 4QInstruction. While he does advocate prayer as an efficacious means of relating to the Deity (*Sir* 22:17-23:6), the bulk of the instruction stands in the tradition of *Proverbs* and other ancient Near Eastern texts, with an emphasis on the sharing and internalizing of maxims,

(72) On the prophetic aspects of *Ben Sira*, see J. Marböck, *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira* (BBB 37; Bonn: Hanstein, 1971).

(73) The special attention to Elijah in *Sir* 48:1-16 is another indicator of the high regard for prophecy in this instruction.

now mediated through the Torah. (74) With its focus on the speculative *raz nihyeh* as the most important source for acquiring knowledge, the basic framework in *4QInstruction* is quite different.

## Eschatology

These two sapiential works also diverge radically on eschatology and divine retribution: *4QInstruction* promises a blessed afterlife for righteous individuals, while Ben Sira vehemently dismisses this possibility. Several studies have examined the eschatology of *4QInstruction* and the implications of belief in the afterlife for a Jewish sapiential text. (75) Only a few highlights are necessary to convey the significance of this aspect. In the opening fragment, the addressee receives promises about an eschatological moment when “all injustice will end again, and the time (קץ) of tru[th] will be complete [...] in all periods (קצו) of eternity” (*4Q416* 1 13-14). The use of such terms as קץ and פקודה in an apocalyptic context underscores the eschatological orientation of this text, especially the emphasis on a final “visitation” (פקודה). (76) For the wicked category in this framework, the “eternal pit” (i.e., Sheol) becomes their exclusive endpoint (*4Q418* 69 ii 6), as opposed to the universal destiny of humanity. (77) This presentation in *4Q418* 69 ii 6-9 depicts a stark contrast between the elect group and the wicked ones, who are also called the “foolish of heart.” At the final reckoning, angels will “arise” to judge these iniquitous persons. (78) In contrast, righteous individuals will receive blessings, such that “all the sons of his truth will be accepted with favor” (*4Q416* 1 10). These persons will enjoy “everlasting glory and eternal peace” (*4Q418* 126 ii 8). There is also mention of “et[ernal] glory” (שמהת עולם) in *4Q417* 2 i 12. The righteous *mevin* can take

(74) R.A. Horsley, *Scribe, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), has pointed to the sage’s emphasis on oral teaching as the primary mode of communication.

(75) See Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 168-215; Adams, *Wisdom in Transition*, 221-32. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 44 n. 142, itemizes references to eschatological judgment in the extant fragments.

(76) On the understanding of פקודה as “visitation,” see Lange, *Weishheit und Prädestination*, 61. The term appears 16 times in the extant fragments of *4QInstruction*, usually with an eschatological meaning.

(77) There is also mention of Korah in *4Q423* 5 1, a reference to *Num* 16:32-33 and the earth “swallowing” up those associated with this rebellion. In *4QInstruction*, the image relates to an apocalyptic context.

(78) É. Puech, “Les Fragments Eschatologiques de *4QInstruction* (*4Q416* 1 et *4Q418* 69 ii, 81-81a, 127),” *RevQ* 22 (2005): 89-119, has argued that this passage suggests physical resurrection, especially the reference to “all who exist forever, who seek the truth” in line 7. Yet these figures almost certainly represent the angels.

comfort that his “lot” is among the holy ones (4Q418 81 4-5), perhaps implying some sort of spiritual fellowship with the angels. (79)

In contrast, Ben Sira does not incorporate apocalyptic eschatology into his traditional advice. In the longstanding mode of Israel’s wisdom tradition, he maintains that Sheol is the universal endpoint of every individual. One should practice “fear of the Lord” and cultivate a good reputation for posterity, but hope for a beatific afterlife is totally absent, at least in the sections of *Sirach* that can be traced back to the original sage. (80) For example, “The Lord created human beings out of earth, and makes them return (השיב) to it again” (*Sir* 17:1; cf. *Gen* 2:7; 3:19; *Qoh* 3:20). Such a usage of שוב indicates that for Ben Sira, human beings were never meant to be anything but mortal. His clearest statement on the matter occurs in 41:4: “This is the Lord’s decree for all flesh; why then should you reject the will of the Most High? Whether life lasts for ten years or a hundred or a thousand, there are no questions asked in Hades.” This conclusion leads the sage to a belief that persons should remain virtuous, but also enjoy life while they are able: “Give, and take, and indulge yourself, because in Hades one cannot look for luxury” (*Sir* 14:16). The most important thing a person can do is cultivate and leave behind a good reputation (*Sir* 15:6; 37:26; 39:9; 41:11-13; 44:8), which is the only thing of permanence for human beings. This promise of a good name seems to represent Ben Sira’s answer to Qoheleth’s logic (i.e., *Qoh* 3:11: “The people of long ago are not remembered”) and perhaps the eschatological ideas found in the Enochic corpus. (81) While he clearly opposes any suggestion of an afterlife, there is no indication of a dialogue with 4QInstruction in any of Ben Sira’s reflections on the topic, but rather a general opposition to all eschatological proposals.

It is true that the prayer for deliverance in *Sir* 36:1-22 (33:1-13a; 36:16b-22 in G<sup>1</sup>) contains such terms as קץ (“end”) and מועד (“appointed time”) (v. 10) and an apocalyptic scene (“Give new signs, and work other wonders” in v. 6), but this section does not

(79) Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 42-44.

(80) Both the G<sup>1</sup> and G<sup>2</sup> translations of *Sirach* include multiple references to eternal reward and the afterlife. According to É. Puech, “Ben Sira 48:11 et la Résurrection,” in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed. H.W. Attridge et al.; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990), 81-91, the Heb. text of 48:11 affirms a limited understanding of resurrection. The text is fragmentary, and it is difficult to prove such a belief based on 48:11, especially when one considers the force of passages like *Sir* 14:17. See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 96; Adams, *Wisdom in Transition*, 208-10.

(81) On the relationship between *Ben Sira* and *1 Enoch*, see R.A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment* (SBLEJL 8; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

reflect the larger outlook in *Sirach* and is probably a later insertion. The violent plea in v. 12 is difficult to contextualize: “Crush the heads of the hostile rulers who say, ‘There is no one but ourselves.’” If original to the sage, it is difficult to determine which ruler(s) he might be targeting, whether Antiochus III or another figure. (82) Antiochus is remembered for positive relations with Jews during this period. (83) Moreover, if the sage had such strong convictions about foreign rule, the rest of the instruction would likely reflect the same fiery outlook as chapter 36. Elsewhere in the instruction, Ben Sira maintains a measured attitude towards ruling authorities. He is pragmatic about how his charges should deal with powerful persons. (84) A full review of the passage and debate surrounding it is not possible here, but the evidence militates strongly against understanding chapter 36 as original to the sage. Without this unit as part of the initial instruction, nationalistic eschatology ceases to be part of the agenda in this text, even in the Praise of the Ancestors. *Ben Sira* has an orientation that does not correlate with the basic aims of an “eschatologized” sapiential work like *4QInstruction*.

## Conclusion

Since the publication of *4QInstruction*, many studies have noticed commonalities between this sapiential document and *Ben Sira*. Both texts deal with such mundane matters as borrowing and lending, including pointed warnings about surety and family relations, and some concentrated attention on the role of women in households. In addition, there are certain textual links, such as the heavy reliance on hortatory language to convey advice about acceptable behavior. One of the more significant parallels is the use of the *Genesis* creation stories to explain the relationship between God, world, and humanity. The fact that these two instructional texts make an interpretive move that is absent from *Proverbs* and barely present in *Qoheleth* suggests a notable shift during the late Second Temple period.

Yet our discussion has shown major differences between these two documents. *Ben Sira* addresses a more elite audience of scribal

(82) For background on the social context and an argument for the originality of the passage, see B.G. Wright, “‘Put the Nations in Fear of You’: Ben Sira and the Problem of Foreign Rule,” *SBLSP* 38 (1999): 77-93, who suggests a number of veiled criticisms against foreign rulers in *Sirach* (e.g., 4:15; chapters 10-11).

(83) Antiochus III receives favorable treatment in Josephus (*Ant.* 12.129-153), and he was contemporaneous with Simon II.

(84) See, for example, *Sir* 31:12-32:13, and the encouragement of collegial interaction with powerful persons.

retainers, while *4QInstruction* directs prohibitions to a group of farmers and other struggling citizens who lack the resources of the established classes. *Ben Sira* cites the traditional “fear of the Lord,” Wisdom, and now the Torah as blueprints for the virtuous life, and he goes out of his way to oppose speculative, mantic wisdom as an acceptable practice. In contrast, *4QInstruction* appeals to the enigmatic *raz nihyeh* as the key to success in the earthly and heavenly realms. *4QInstruction* also has a developed framework for eschatological judgment, while Ben Sira does not allow for an afterlife and is clearly aware of and opposed to apocalyptic understandings of the created order. Finally, some of the terminological links proposed by Rey in his recent critical edition are not necessarily indicative of a dialogue between the two texts or even identical periods of composition. As several textual analyses have demonstrated, the connections between *4QInstruction* and other documents from the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus, especially the *Hodayot* and the Treatise on the Two Spirits, are more compelling. Therefore, it does not necessarily follow that *4QInstruction* dates from the period of Ben Sira’s career, or even from the pre-Maccabean era. As analysis of this cryptic and fascinating text continues, *Ben Sira* remains a logical point of comparison for *4QInstruction*. Yet the differences between these two texts are as significant and perhaps more profound than any similarities.

Samuel L. ADAMS

# THE LITURGICAL-ESCHATOLOGICAL PRIEST OF THE *SELF-GLORIFICATION* *HYMN* <sup>(1)</sup>

## *Summary*

The so-called *Self-Glorification Hymn* famously relates the first-person boasts of a mysterious figure who claims to be incomparable in glory and apparently takes a seat among the “gods” (אלים). The present study seeks to shed new light on the much-discussed question of this figure’s identity in three parts. First, it will consider selected aspects of the recent debate as to the identity of the speaker, particularly the recent revival of Maurice Baillet’s suggestion that the protagonist is the archangel Michael. Second, it will lend modest support to the view of many scholars that he is a priestly character, even though priesthood is nowhere explicitly mentioned in the Hymn. Third, and finally, on the basis of a comparison of the language used in connection with the speaker in the *Canticle of Michael* to that linked to the righteous liturgical community in the *Canticle of the Righteous*, as well as comparative evidence from other sectarian writings, it will argue that the speaker is to be understood as a present member of the community who, by means of liturgical experience, has undergone an extraordinary transformation.

## **Prefatory Remarks**

FOUR witnesses to the Hymn, which have been characterized as comprising two different recensions, are extant: a portion of a Cave 4 manuscript originally thought to be part of a version of the *War Scroll*, now commonly referred to as “Recension B” (4Q491 11 I), and portions of three *Hodayot* manuscripts, now commonly

(1) This article is a revised version of a paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in New Orleans in November of 2009. Special thanks are due to Angela Harkins and Eileen Schuller for reading and commenting on an earlier draft. I would also like to thank the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture for generously supporting my research.

labeled “Recension A” (4Q427 7, 1QH<sup>a</sup> 25:34-27:3, and 4Q471b + 4Q431 I). (2) Paleographically, all four manuscripts date from the late Hasmonean/Herodian periods and, on the basis of thematic and linguistic considerations, a sectarian provenance is probable. The relationship between the preserved manuscripts is complex, and I shall not treat it in detail here. (3) It will suffice to note that the thematic and linguistic affinities between 4Q491 11 I on the one hand, and the composite text constructed out of the three *Hodayot* witnesses on the other, have been enough to convince most, but not all, scholars that these manuscripts represent two recensions of the same work. (4)

It must also be noted at the outset that in the *editio princeps* of 4Q491 11 I (Recension B) Maurice Baillet identified not one, but two hymns. This fragmentary column reads as follows: (5)

8 [...] wonderfully, awesome deeds [...] 9 [...] his might. Let the right[eous one]s (6) rejoice, let the holy ones exult in יִרְנְנוּ צִדִּיקִים וְיִגְלוּ (קדושים...in righteousness 10 (בצדק) [...]Israel. He established his tr[uth] from of old, and the mysteries of his wisdom in al[l...] might 11 [...] and the council of the poor for an eternal congregation וַעֲצַת וְעוֹלָמִים (אֲבוֹנִים לְעֶדֶת עוֹלָמִים) and [they are to say, “Blessed be God who has seated me among] (7) the eternally 12 perfect (תְּמִימֵי עוֹלָמִים)—(given me) a throne of power in the congregation of the divine beings (כִּסֵּא עֹז) (בעֲדַת אֱלֹהִים). No king of old will sit therein, neith[er] will their nobles

(2) The labels Recension A and Recension B were first introduced by E. Eshel, “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 189-91. Cf. eadem, in E. Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 422. Throughout this study, column and line numbers of 1QH<sup>a</sup> are given according to H. Stegemann, E. Schuller, and C. Newsom, *1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> with Incorporation of 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>a-f</sup>* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).

(3) For in-depth discussion of the relationship between the different manuscripts, see M. Wise, “מי כמוני באלים: A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 25:35-26:10,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 173-219; Eshel, “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 175-203; F. García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The ‘I’ of Two Qumran Hymns,” in *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (ed. E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 105-25.

(4) For the generally accepted view, see, e.g., J. Duhaime, *The War Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 35-40. To my knowledge, the dissenting position is expressed only by García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 105-25, esp. 114-18.

(5) Transcription and translation generally draw from Wise, “מי כמוני,” 182-83. Line numbering follows M. Baillet, *Qumran grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 26-7.

(6) Following the reading of Baillet. Wise reads a[n]g[e]l[s]=א[ל]י[הו]א.

(7) The reconstruction follows Wise. On the basis of the sudden switch from third person plural to first person singular forms, a reconstruction of this type seems likely. See further the discussion below.



[...No]ne can compare **13** [to] my glory; none has been exalted save myself, and none can oppose me. I sit in [... hea]ven, and none **14** [su]rround (me). I am reckoned with the divine beings, my habitation is in the holy congregation (אני עם אלים אתחשב ומכוני בעדת קודש). [My] desi[re] is not according to flesh, [rather] my [por]tion lies in the glory of **15** the holy [dwe]lling (8) ([מע] [לי בכבוד גור] תי כיא אם גור) (תן הקודש לא כבשר תאון) (מי כמוני וימא] כול רע הדמה ביא (9) [W]ho has been accounted despicable like me, yet who is like me in my glory? (ומיא בכבודי ידמה) Who [...] **16** [like] me? Who bea[rs] sorrows like me and who [suffe]rs evil like me (מיא ישא] צערים) (מיא כמוני וימא] כול רע הדמה ביא נשנתי והוריה לוא) (10) [...] my glory is with the sons of the king, not (with) [pure] gold nor the gold of Ophir. **19** [...] L (ל) **20** (11) [Exult,] righteous ones, in the God of (צדיקים באלוהי) [...] Give praise] in the holy dwelling, sing t[o him...] (הללון במעון הקודש) (21) [...]Pr]oclain with expressions of gladness, [burst forth in] eternal joy without cea[sing...] (השמיצו בהניה רנה) (הביעו ב] שמחת) (עולמים ואין הש]בת) [...] to raise the horn on hi[gh...] **23** [...] to make known his hand in might [...]

The first hymn, found in lines 8-18, includes the first person speech of the exalted figure whose identity will be the focus of this study. The second, appearing in lines 20-23, contains the very fragmentary call to prayer of a group labeled the “righteous.” Baillet called these two hymns the “*Canticle of Michael*” and the “*Canticle of the Righteous*” respectively. (12) Many scholars assume that versions of both of these hymns are preserved in Recension A as well. However, while it seems clear that versions of the *Canticle of Michael* appear in each recension, it is difficult to say the same about the *Canticle of the Righteous*. There are definite verbal and thematic parallels between Recension B’s *Canticle of the Righteous* and the Hymn following the *Canticle of Michael* in Recension A, but the variants make it difficult to ascertain whether these compositions are in fact to be considered different recensions of the same

(8) Again, reconstructions follow Wise.

(9) See Wise’s explanation of this reconstruction, “מי כמוני,” 180.

(10) Following Baillet. Wise reads אלים מעמ]די.

(11) At the edge of the left margin of l. 19, the ascending stroke of a large *lamed* may be discerned. The function of this letter or the word of which it was once a part cannot be determined.

(12) Note, however, that ll. 8-11 also contain plural references, such as “the right[eous one]s” and “the council of the poor.”



work. (13) In the following discussion I utilize the generally accepted “recension” terminology with the awareness that this characterization may not be entirely accurate with respect to the second hymn.

### The Michael Identification

In DJD VII, Baillet identified the approximately sixty fragments of 4Q491 as a Cave 4 version of the *War Scroll*, which differs significantly from the Cave 1 version. Presumably relating fragment 11 to the part of *IQM* where Michael is sent as an aid to the righteous earthly community (17:6ff.), he identified the first person speaker of the Hymn as the archangel Michael, the leader of the celestial eschatological army destined to defeat the forces of darkness.

Few scholars followed Baillet’s suggestion. (14) Most famously, Morton Smith challenged this identification on the basis of the facts that Michael is nowhere mentioned in 4Q491 11 I and that the comparable context in *IQM* provides no occasion for such a speech. (15) Moreover, Smith reasoned that the speaker’s anthropological perspective indicates that he was not originally at home in heaven, and thus must instead be understood as an exalted human figure. No angel, he argued, would contrast himself with “the kings of old/the East” (מלכי קדם) and “their nobles” (נדיביהמה). An archangel such as Michael would take his throne in heaven for granted. But “this parvenu not only boasts of his, but in doing so makes clear that he was not originally at home in the heavens.” (16) Several commentators after Smith

(13) See, e.g., the comments of J.J. Collins and D. Dimant, “A Thrice-Told Hymn: A Response to Eileen Schuller,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 153.

(14) For a prominent exception, see A.S. van der Woude’s review of DJD VII in *TRu* 55 (1990): 256-57. See also M. Hengel, “Zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Jes 53 in vorchristlicher Zeit,” in *Der leidende Gottesknecht: Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* (ed. B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher; FAT 14; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996), 90; García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 118-24. Dimant (Collins and Dimant, “A Thrice-Told Hymn,” 154) originally expressed sympathy for the identification of the speaker as an angel based on the appearance of terms that only appear elsewhere in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, such as “sons of the king” (בני המלך) and “gold of Ophir” (כתם אופיר). Upon further study, however, she concluded that the speaker is indeed to be understood as a human being. See D. Dimant, “A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7, 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 161.

(15) M. Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM<sup>a</sup>” in *Archaeology and History*, 181-88. Although published in 1990, the original paper dates back to 1985. A revised version of the paper appeared as “Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491” in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 290-301.

(16) Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens,” 186.

have followed a similar line of reasoning. For example, Devorah Dimant notes that it would be inappropriate for an angel to compare himself with “kings” (l. 12) and refer to himself as teaching by using a phrase applied elsewhere to humans (מִזֶּל שְׁפִתִּי; l. 17). (17) Esther Eshel observes that the speaker’s claim in line 14, “[My] desi[re] is not according to flesh” (לֹא כִבְשָׁר תֵּאֵוֶןתִּי), emphasizes his separation from ordinary mortals—a proud assertion certainly out of place in the mouth of an angel. (18) Scholars also point to the protagonist’s very human characteristic of bearing “sorrows” in line 16. (19)

An additional factor in the wide-spread rejection of Baillet’s theory has been an influential study by Martin Abegg. On the basis of differences of script and orthography, Abegg divided the material originally edited by Baillet as a single manuscript (4Q491) into three distinct manuscripts. He labeled the first two 4Q491a and 4Q491b. The former preserves fragments of a document similar to *IQM* (especially columns 14-17), and the latter consists of material related to the eschatological war but different from *IQM*. In addition, due to differences in letter height, Abegg separated fragment 11 (along with fragment 12) from 4Q491b, and labeled it 4Q491c. Since the canticles of 4Q491c possess no parallels to the *War Rule*, he suggested that the manuscript belongs to a different composition altogether, perhaps even a version of the *Hodayot*. (20) His isolation of this fragment from the rest of the scroll was supported by Eshel, who found that some of the orthography and terminology of 4Q491c are unique to this text alone. (21)

Abegg’s conclusions influenced speculation regarding the identity of the speaker in 4Q491 11 I. Indeed, partially due to the separation

(17) Dimant, “A Synoptic Comparison,” 161.

(18) E. Eshel, “The Identification of the ‘Speaker’ of the Self-Glorification Hymn,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 626; eadem, DJD XXIX, 422.

(19) See, e.g., I. Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. D. Maisel; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000), 77; J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 144-45. As Collins warns, this interpretation is dependent on the reconstruction.

(20) M. Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Evans and P. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 61-73. He assigns Baillet’s frgs. 8-10, 11 II, 12-15, 18, 24-28, 31-33, and 35 to 4Q491a. He includes in 4Q491b frgs. 1-7, 16-17, 19, 20-21, and 23. See M. Abegg, “4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 137, n. 6.

(21) Eshel, “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 176.

of 4Q491c from a concrete literary context, scholars have generally explicated the meaning of the hymn with reference to the community context of the *Hodayot*. (22) Florentino García Martínez has rejected this approach, and claims that there is insufficient evidence to warrant the separation of 4Q491c from 4Q491b. (23) For him, this means that 4Q491 11 I is to be identified as part of the *War Rule* related material in 4Q491b and, since he also rejects the notion that the three *Hodayot* manuscripts preserve a different version of the same work, that the identity of the speaker of the Hymn is to be understood exclusively within this context. As such, he sees Baillet's Michael identification as the most plausible.

My own examination of the photographs has been inconclusive. However, even if García Martínez is correct that fragment 11 should not be separated from 4Q491b, I believe that the Michael identification is unlikely. For one, the remains of 4Q491b do not relate to the hymnic material found at the end of *IQM*, where Michael is mentioned. (24) Moreover, in his recent monograph on the *War Scroll*, Brian Schultz observes that even if the Hymn was originally part of 4Q491b, it must have been removed from such a war context very quickly since it is not found in any of the extant *M* fragments. Therefore, "while García Martínez may well be right in that this *Self-Glorification Hymn*...is not related to H as is currently thought, its relationship to M, if there ever was any, would have been short lived." (25) Furthermore, Schultz points out that the Hymn's contents are out of character with the rest of the extant *M* material. Thus, if the speaker of the Hymn were indeed Michael, the head of the heavenly eschatological army, it would be

all the more of an anomaly in *M* since all the texts on the eschatological war never do anything more than taking the existence of such an angelic being for granted. Nowhere are any of the specifics of his role during

(22) Even before Abegg's study, Smith suggested that the speaker is to be understood as a human being most reminiscent of the author of the *Hodayot*, who similarly proclaims his sufferings, his freedom from carnal desires, the overpowering quality of his teaching, his admittance into the company of angels and participation in their lot, and his possession of glory like that of God. See further the discussion and secondary literature cited by García Martínez, "Old Texts," 105-9.

(23) García Martínez, "Old Texts," 111-14. Professor Abegg has recently informed me in a personal communication that he is no longer convinced that 4Q491 may be divided into three separate manuscripts. He now agrees with García Martínez that 4Q491c should not be separated from 4Q491b and, therefore, that 4Q491 is comprised of only two distinct manuscripts.

(24) They may, however, be related to *IQM* 5-9. See B. Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (IQM) Reconsidered* (STDJ 76; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 375-376.

(25) Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 30, n. 67. Cf. *ibid.*, 379, n. 39.

the eschatological war described; we only know that he is ‘there’ and that because of his involvement, whatever it may be, the war will be won. Why then would a scribe isolate this one aspect of the angelic being’s role and insert it into a body of literature which details the responsibilities of mortals only? (26)

Given these arguments, it is best to conclude that the identity of the speaker in *Self-Glorification Hymn B* should not be tied strictly to the context of *4Q491b*, let alone to the final columns of *1QM*. This makes the identification of the speaker as Michael unlikely.

### The Priestly Identity of the Speaker

Among the vast majority of scholars who prefer a human speaker, there is no consensus as to his precise identity. Admitting the difficulty of the problem, Émile Puech leaves open several possibilities: “Maître / Instructeur / Sage, Messie roi-prêtre (?)” (27) Hartmut Stegemann prefers to view the text as an example of “collective messianism,” where, comparable to Isaiah’s Songs of the Servant, “sometimes the collective of the people of Israel is spoken off [*sic*] like an individual.” In this case, the “I” of the text would represent the collective of Israel “raised to a quasi heavenly status.” (28) Pointing out several apparently royal features of the speaker, especially his seat on a heavenly throne, Israel Knohl prefers to see the figure as the royal messiah. (29) Alternatively, Eric Miller suggests that the protagonist of the Hymn speaks in the voice of Enoch, the exalted patriarch who, according to Enochic tradition, is identified with the “Chosen One” who will “sit on the throne of glory.” (30)

(26) Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 30, n. 67.

(27) É. Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, resurrection, vie éternelle* (2 vols.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993), 2:494. Apparently, he prefers above all the “sage” possibility, for earlier (p. 492) he labels the text “un hymne des justes et une exaltation du sage avec les petits et les pauvres.”

(28) H. Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 17 (1996):502. A similar position is held by A. Steudel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God: Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM),” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 525, n. 93, and É. Puech, “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 489. See also Hengel, “Zur Wirkungsgeschichte,” 90.

(29) Knohl, *The Messiah*, 80-86. It should be noted that the speaker’s enthronement in heaven is never explicitly mentioned in the preserved text and results from textual reconstruction. See *4Q491* 11 I, 11-12. Furthermore, enthronement need not be taken as evidence of exclusively royal identity in contemporary literature. See, e.g., C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 207-8.

(30) *1 En.* 45:3. See E. Miller, “The Self-Glorification Hymn Reexamined,” *Henoch* 31 (2009): 307-24.

One of the leading theories, which I would like to consider more carefully, views the speaker as an exalted priestly figure. (31) As I have noted above, priesthood is never explicitly mentioned in the Hymn. Nevertheless, numerous verbal and thematic connections with explicitly priestly texts authored or studied and revered by the Qumranites make this identification the most likely possibility. In particular, I would like to focus on the speaker's distinction from "flesh," his teaching function, and his possession of glory (כבוד) and position among the angels.

### *Separation from "Flesh"*

In line 14 of *Self-Glorification Hymn B* the speaker reports that his "desi[re] is not according to flesh" (לא כבשר תאו[תי]). The precise sense of this statement has been debated among scholars. Eshel, for instance, argues that the human protagonist is emphasizing that he cannot be tempted like other mortals. (32) García Martínez prefers to read the phrase as an indication that the speaker is an angel who "does not follow human paths." (33) Alternatively, Fletcher-Louis sees the phrase as an example of "a wider transcendence-of-flesh theme in the divine humanity tradition," and further suggests that it may be an expression of deliberate asceticism coinciding with a mystical experience. (34) Without endorsing any of these specific interpretations, I would like to observe several texts preserved Qumran that assume the distinction of exalted human priests from "flesh."

- (1) In *Jubilees* 31:14, Isaac prays on behalf of Levi and his elevated descendants as follows: "May you (alone) out of all humanity approach him to serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and like the holy ones." (35) According to James VanderKam, the literal meaning of the term he translates as "humanity" is "flesh." (36) Indeed, in his retroversion of this verse into the

(31) Among numerous studies, the following have argued for a priestly identification of the speaker: J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 146-9; Eshel, DJD XXIX, 426-7; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 199-216. See also J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2,104; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1998), 308.

(32) Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 204-16.

(33) Eshel, DJD XXIX, 422.

(34) García Martínez, "Old Texts," 119.

(35) Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 213.

(36) Translations of *Jubilees* follow J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; *Scriptores Aethiopici* 88; Louvain: Peeters, 1989).

(37) VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 204.

original Hebrew, he plausibly suggests מכל בשר for the phrase “out of all humanity.” (37)

- (2) In a Qumran fragment of the *Aramaic Levi Document* describing the patriarch Levi’s heavenly vision (4QLevi<sup>c</sup> 1), God informs Levi that “I have loved you more than all flesh” (רעיתך מן כול) (בשר[א]).
- (3) The exalted priestly addressee of 4QInstruction<sup>d</sup> (4Q418) 81 is designated by God “a most holy one” and a “first born” who has the power “to turn away wrath” from the earthly elect. (38)  
Lines 1-2 of the fragment state that God has separated this extraordinary figure “from amongst all fleshly spirit” (הבדילכה בכל) (רוח בשר). (39)
- (4) At the climax of his long hymn praising the heroes of Israel’s past, *Ben Sira* describes the Zadokite high priest Simon II in exalted terms surpassing any offered for previous figures (50:1-21). In this chapter’s description of the daily (40) temple service, Simon is portrayed as the exalted conveyor of the divine presence, which permeates the ritual of the earthly temple. (41) The continuation of the chapter describes how the laypeople, “all flesh” (כל בשר), hurry to bow on the ground (50:17), while splendid Simon is surrounded by “all the sons of Aaron in their glory” (כל בני אהרן בכבודם; 50:12). God’s selection of Moses “from all [flesh]” in *Sir* 45:4 may capture a similar idea. (42)

(37) J. VanderKam, “Isaac’s Blessing of Levi and his Descendants in Jubilees 31,” in *The Provo International Conference*, 501.

(38) On the identification of this anonymous figure as a priest, see J. Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 86; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 66-73.

(39) For the rare occurrences of the phrase רוח בשר in Qumran writings, see J. Strugnell and D.J. Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mūsār I<sup>e</sup> Mēvīn): 4Q415ff.* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press), 304. See further A.E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 104-6.

(40) Most commentators understand the ceremonies in this chapter as relating to Yom Kippur, but see F. Fearghail, “Sir 50, 5-21: Yom Kippur or the Daily Whole-Offering?” *Bib* 59 (1978): 301-16, who shows on the basis of *m. Tamid* 6:4-7:3 that the ceremonies relate more closely to those of the *tamid*. See also C.T.R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996), 50.

(41) See Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 49-50.

(42) Much of the Hebrew praise of Moses is fragmentary. However, in the Greek, God “consecrated” (ἡγιάσεν) Moses (as priest?) and “chose him out of all flesh” (ἐξελέξατο αὐτὸν ἐκ πάσης σαρκός). On the exaltation of Moses at Qumran, see C. Fletcher-Louis, “4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 240-42; idem, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 2, 94; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997), 185-98.

- (5) Similarly, the blessing addressed to the Zadokite priests in *IQSb* 3 distinguishes these exalted figures, who enjoy a place in the holy dwelling, from the ordinary laypeople: “May he bless the council of all flesh by your hand” (ועצת כול בשר בידכה יברך) (3:28).

### *Teaching Function*

The priestly identification of the speaker is most often supported by the fact he lays special emphasis upon his role as a teacher. Indeed, in both recensions of the Hymn, he boldly proclaims that “no teaching is equal,” presumably to his own teaching (והוריה לוא תדמה) [להוריתי]. (43) The teaching function of the priesthood is well known from biblical sources. (44) More importantly, the protagonist’s claim here coincides with the pedagogical role attributed to exalted human or angelic priestly figures in several documents preserved at Qumran. Notably, many of these examples derive from the same documents referred to above with regard to the priests’ separation from “flesh.”

- (1) In *Jubilees* 31: 15, after Isaac compares Levi’s descendants to the angelic priests serving in the celestial temple, he prays that they will also serve as mediators of divine instruction and judgment to Israel: “They will declare the word of the Lord justly and will justly judge all his verdicts. They will tell my ways to Jacob and my paths to Israel.” (45)
- (2) According to *4QApocryphon of Levib?*, the exalted eschatological priest will illuminate the world and teach supernal wisdom to those destined for salvation (מאמרה כמאמר שמין ואלפונה כרעות אל) (שמש עלמה תניר ויתזה נורהא בכול קצוי ארעא 4Q541 9 3-4). (46)
- (3) The blessing directed toward the eschatological high priest in *IQSb* 4 indicates that this figure’s teachings illuminate the world and the elect earthly community with knowledge: “May he make you hol[y] among his people, and for a light [...] to the world with knowledge and to illuminate the face of the many” (וישימכה) (קוד[ש] בעמו ולמאור[ ] לתבל בדעת ולהאיר פני רבים 1. 26).

(43) *4Q491* 11 I, 16-17; *4Q471b* 1a 3-4.

(44) See, e.g., *Lev* 10:11; *Deut* 33:10; *Mal* 2:7.

(45) Cf. *Deut* 33:10.

(46) To be sure, this figure is never identified as a priest. However, the identification appears to be confirmed by the report in 9 2 that “he will atone (ויכפר) for all the children of his generation.” In addition, the difficult צצא of frg. 24 may refer to the donning of the high priest’s ציץ. See, e.g., K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 80. Parallels between the *Self-Glorification Hymn* and *4Q541* 9, as well as *IQSb* 4, are emphasized by Eshel, DJD XXIX, 425.



- (4) The blessing of the Zadokite priests in *IQSb* 3 also envisions a priestly teaching function: “Words of blessing for the M[askil to bless] the Sons of Zadok, the priests whom God chose to strengthen his covenant [...] all his precepts in the midst of his people and to teach them as he commanded...and from what flows forth from your lips all...” (כול משפטיו בתוך עמו ולהורותם) (כאשר צוה...וממזל שפתיכה כולן משפט and מזל שפתיים are paralleled by the speaker’s use of those terms in line 17 of Self-Glorification Hymn B: “Who can endure the flow of my lips?...And who can compare with my judgments?” (מזל שפתי מי יכיל...ומיא ידמה במשפטי).
- (5) The first of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, which describes the establishment and functions of the angelic priesthood, preserves a related scenario utilizing similar language: “...knowledge among the priests of the inner sanctum. And from their mouths (come) teachings concerning all matters of holiness together with precepts of...” (דעת בכוהני קורב ומפיהם הורות כול) (קדושים עם משפטי 4Q400 1 I, 17). (47) It is not clear from this fragment who is to be the recipient of this teaching. However, it is reasonable to assume that it is meant for the שבי פשע, the penitents mentioned in the previous line.
- (6) The priestly addressee of 4Q418 81 12 is charged to “open a spring of all the holy ones,” (פתח מקור כול קדושים). This may plausibly be interpreted as a call for him to unleash the wisdom of the angels and make it accessible to the earthly community. (48) Reminiscent of *Self-Glorification Hymn B* and *IQSb* 3:27, line 1 of the fragment mentions the lips of the priest in connection with a liquid flow (שפתיכה פתח מקור לברך קדושים).

### *Possession of Glory (כבוד) and Position among the Angels*

Especially in the light of the above evidence, the speaker’s possession of glory and position among the angels might be understood as indications of priestly status. In a span of six lines in *Self-Glorification Hymn B*, the speaker boasts of his illustrious glory (כבודי) no less than three times (ll. 13, 15, 18), and also reports that his “[por]tion lies in the glory of the holy [dwel]ling” (גורלי בכבוד [מען])

(47) The translation follows that of C. Newsom in E. Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 178.

(48) See L. Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God’: Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (ed. L. Stuckenbruck and W. North; JSNTSup 263; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 63-69; Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 73-76.

(הקודש). Both versions of the Hymn tell of his position among the angels. Thus, in Recension B, “I am reckoned with the divine beings, my habitation is in the holy congregation” (אני עם אלים אתחשב ומכוני; בעדת קודש; 1.14), and in Recension A, “a friend of the holy ones” (רע לקדושים; 4Q427 7 10). The possession of glory by exalted human priests envisioned as enjoying a position among the angels occurs in some of the priestly texts mentioned above. For example, in 4Q418 81 4-5, we are told that God has cast the lot of the addressee such that his glory is very great (הפיל גורלכה וכבודכה הרבה מואדה). Like the speaker of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, his lot is cast “amongst all the divine beings” (בכול [א]ל[ים]). Similarly, *Jubilees* 31:14 reads: “May the Lord give you and your descendants extremely great honor...The descendants of your sons will be like them [the angels of the presence and the holy ones] in honor, greatness and holiness.” The word “honor” in this verse may with certainty be retroverted to the original Hebrew כבוד. (49)

### *The Speaker as Liturgical-Eschatological Priest*

There are indeed several good hints that the speaker is a priest. But is he to be understood, as many have argued, as a purely eschatological figure destined to arrive in the imminent future? (50) Or, as Morton Smith has claimed, was he a present member of the community who had undergone some type of extraordinary experience? (51)

In my opinion, the speaker should be understood as a member of the Qumran community who should be considered “eschatological” only inasmuch as the liturgical experience allowed him to repeatedly escape linear historical time and be together with the angels. (52) This

(49) It should be noted that if the Latin witness to this verse preserves the superior text, glory is not attributed to Levi and his descendants here at all. Improving upon the defective Ethiopic, the Latin reads “*magno intellegere gloriam eius*.” According to this reading, Isaac hopes that Levi and his children will be granted an *understanding* of the divine glory and the full gravity of the privilege of serving so near to it. See further the discussion of VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 203-4.

(50) The most prominent proponents of this position have been J.J. Collins and E. Eshel. See, e.g., Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 136-53; idem, “A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism,” *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys* (ed. J.J. Collins and M. Fishbane; Albany: State University of New York Press), 43-58; Eshel, “The Identification of the ‘Speaker’”; eadem, DJD XXIX, 423-27.

(51) “Two ascended to Heaven,” 297-99. See further P. Alexander, *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts* (LSTS 61; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2006), 90-91.

(52) Cf. the discussion of Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 205-16. For the significance of the repeated experience of liturgical time at Qumran, see esp. E. Wolfson, “Seven Mysteries of Knowledge: Qumran E/sotericism Recovered,” in *The Idea of*

argument is supported by a comparison of the language used in connection with the speaker in the *Canticle of Michael* to that linked to the righteous liturgical community in the *Canticle of the Righteous*, which has largely been ignored in research related to the identity of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*'s speaker.

Internal comparison of the two hymns in both recensions reveals a special affinity between the speaker and the community. In the *Canticle of Michael* of Recension A, the speaker is labeled "beloved of the king" (ידיד המלך; 4Q427 7 I, 10 vis-à-vis 4Q431 1 6). A few lines later, in the *Canticle of the Righteous*, the members of the community are called to sing to God by means of the vocative "beloved ones" (ידידים; 4Q427 7 I, 13). (53) In Recension B, while the exalted singular figure enjoys a position "in the glory of the holy dwelling" (בכבוד [מען] קודש; ll. 14-15), the community is bidden to give praise to God "in the holy dwelling" (במעון הקודש; l. 20; cf. 4Q427 7 I, 14-15). If we permit ourselves to compare between recensions, we may note that while in the first hymn the exalted figure takes a seat in "a throne of power in the congregation of the divine beings" (כסא עון בעדת אלים; 4Q491 11 I, 12), in the second, the poor righteous community (54) takes its place "with the divine beings in the assembly of the community" (עם אלים בעדת יחד; 4Q427 7 II, 9). Furthermore, the speaker's expression of suffering, "who bears sorrows like me?" (מיא ישןא) [צעררים כמוני], may be related to the important references to the poor in the hymn. (55) Thus, just prior to the shift into the first person in the *Canticle of Michael*, we hear of the "council of the poor for an eternal congregation" (עצת אביונים לעדת עולמים). (56) In the *Canticle of the Righteous*, God "lifts up the poor from the dust to [the eternal height,] and to the clouds he magnifies him in stature, and (he is) with the heavenly beings in the assembly of the community" (וירם מעפר אביון ל[רום עולם] ועד שחקים יגבירוהו בקומה ועם אלים בעדת)

*Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (ed. H. Najman and J. Newman; JSJSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 177-213.

(53) This mirror imagery only occurs in Recension A. Wise takes this as evidence of "the melding process that was the Hodayot redaction." For the epithet ידיד אל, which refers to Benjamin in *Deut* 33:12, as a title transferred to Levi, see 4Q379 1 2; *ALD* 83. Cf. the comments of E. Schuller, *DJD* XXIX, 103.

(54) I interpret the third person singular here (אביון) as a reference to the entire community. This reading appears to be confirmed by the collective commands two lines earlier, ושמיעו ואמ[ן]ר.

(55) So P. de Souza Nogueira, "Ecstatic Worship in the Self-Glorification Hymn," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003), 391-92.

(56) 4Q491 11 I, 11.

(יהד). (57) Finally, it is worth noting that while the speaker's teachings are incomparable, (58) in their call to bless God, the righteous are described as enjoying access to the knowledge of God's mysteries: "Bless the one who wonderfully does majestic deeds...seal[ing] mysteries and revealing hidden things, raising up those who stumble and those among them who fall [by res]toring the step of *those who wait for knowledge*" (ברכו המפלי גאות...[ל]חתום רוים ולגלות נסתרות להרים). (59) Indeed, later on in the Hymn they proclaim: "We have known you, God of righteousness, and we have become enlightened" (ידענוכה אל הצדק והשכלנו). It thus appears that the speaker and the community mirror each other, sharing in three interrelated experiences: exalted heavenly status, suffering, and access to divine knowledge. (60) The speaker, by summoning the righteous community to worship, is evidently leading them to an experience of heavenly glorification comparable to his own.

The language of the two canticles suggests a liturgical context for this activity. This is confirmed by the numerous plural imperatives which call for praise and celebration with the celestial assembly-in Recension B: זמרו, שירו; and in Recension A: זמרו, שירו, etc. Michael Wise has offered the suggestion that the Hymn was sung by the whole community led by the Maskil (at least in the *Hodayot* recension), and that every member of the liturgical community was meant to identify with the first person speaker. (61) This proposal would explain not only the above-mentioned similarities between the speaker and the righteous community, but also the apparent sudden switch from plural to singular grammatical forms in Recension A (*IQH<sup>a</sup>* 25:31), which, as he observes, "requires the conjoining of an initial speaker, the Maskil, with others who presumably began by listening." (62) Although they are laconic, a similar switch from plural to singular must also take place in lines 11-12 of Recension B. The identity of the speaker in the *Self-Glorification Hymn* thus appears to be inseparable from the liturgical community which he summons to worship. (63)

(57) 4Q427 7 II, 8-9.

(58) 4Q491 11 I, 16-17; cf. 4Q471b 1a-d 3-4.

(59) 4Q427 7 I, 18-20.

(60) De Souza Nogueira, "Ecstatic Worship," 392.

(61) Wise, "מי כמוני," 216-19.

(62) Wise, "מי כמוני," 217. Although his argument is based on a reconstruction, his supporting proofs are convincing.

(63) Cf. the comparable suggestion of E. Chazon, "Human and Angelic Prayer in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of*

Although the *Self-Glorification Hymn* never refers to priests or priesthood, the explicit centrality of priestly identity in the experience of the earthly community's liturgical exaltation narrated in other sectarian texts provides further reason to attribute a priestly "liturgical-eschatological" identity to the speaker of the Hymn. In the following pages, I would like to point out two such instances, one deriving from *4QSongs of the Sage* and the other from *1QSh*. (64)

*4QSongs of the Sage*<sup>b</sup> (4Q511) 35

The sectarian document known as *Songs of the Sage* consists of a collection of magical hymns that functioned to protect "the righteous" (i.e., the Qumran community) from evil spirits. By reciting God's praises, the performers waged war against the forces of evil. (65) Much like the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, these Songs contain the powerful first person speech of a privileged individual, the Maskil, as well as numerous calls for the earthly community to worship. In comparison with the speaker of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, the Maskil of the Songs appears to have a much humbler anthropological perspective. (66) However, he does make the unabashed claim that "God made the knowledge of understanding shine in my heart" (כִּי־אֱלֹהִים דַּעַת בִּינָה בְּלִבִּי). (67) Indeed, it is the Maskil's access to and activation of the power of divine knowledge that serves as a weapon against demonic forces. (68) Moreover, a very laconic fragment appears to locate the Maskil "in the shelter of Shaddai...among his holy ones" (4Q511 8). (69)

*the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19-23 January 2000* (ed. E. Chazon; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill 2003), 45.

(64) Depending on one's interpretation of the provenance, function, and purpose of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, one might also consider this document as an additional example. While the majority of this extensive liturgical work appears to pertain to the angelic priesthood, the priestly identity of the earthly worshippers is made explicit in 4Q400 2 6. In this passage the human worshippers candidly compare themselves to the angelic priests: "How shall we be considered [among] them (מֶה [בָּם] נִתְחַשֵּׁב)? And as for our priesthood, how shall it (be considered) in their dwellings (וְכֹהֲנֵתָנוּ מֶה בְּמִעֻנֵּיהֶם)?"

(65) B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (trans. J. Chipman; STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 237.

(66) See, e.g., 4Q511 28-29 3: "You [God] have [pl]aced knowledge in my foundation of dust" (שׁ[מֶתָה דַּעַת בְּסֹדֶר עֲפָרִי]). 4Q511 18 II, 7-8 also may be judged to be speaking in a similar tone, especially in light of the following line, which mentions the "depravities" and "guilt" of the speaker.

(67) 4Q511 18 II, 7-8.

(68) See, e.g., 4Q510 1 4-6.

(69) See Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 270. I accept her suggestion that the fragment depends on *Psalm* 91 and *Isa* 49:2, which serves as a crucial basis for her reconstruction.

The only fragment of the *Songs of the Sage* that explicitly refers to priests is 4Q511 35. The first five lines of this fragment read as follows:

1 [...] against all flesh, and a judgment of vengeance to exterminate wickedness, and for the rag[ing] 2 anger of God (בכול בשר ומשפט). (70) Some of (71) those seven times refined and some of the holy ones God will sancti[fy] 3 for himself as an eternal sanctuary and (as) purity among the cleansed (במזוקקי שבעתים ובקדושים יקדי[ש] לו למקדש עולמים וטהרה בנברים (72)). They shall be 4 priests, his righteous people, his host, and ministers, the angels of his glory 5 (והיו כוהנים עם צדקו צבאו ומשרתים מלאכי כבודו). They shall praise him with wondrous marvels (יהללוהו בהפלא נוראות).

This difficult passage apparently opens with a few words dedicated to God's eschatological judgment and punishment of the wicked. We are immediately informed that the destruction at that time will not be total. Instead, God will consecrate two subgroups from among "those seven times refined" and "the holy ones." As Billah Nitzan notes, the former group refers to the earthly righteous and stems from *Ps* 12:7, מזוקק שבעתים. (73) This phrase may be compared to *IQH<sup>a</sup>* 13:18, where, concerning the member of the earthly community, it states that he is "like purified silver in the furnace of the smiths to be refined seven times" (וככסף מזוקק בכור נופחים לטהר שבעתים). Concerning the latter group, "the holy ones," it is reasonable to assume

(70) Baillet, DJD VII, 237, followed by F. García Martínez and E. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* [2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998], 2:1033 and D. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Vol. 6: Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 6:185, does not end the sentence here. Instead, he prefers to read the מזוקקי שבעתים as the recipients of God's wrath: "et pur la ra[ge de] la colére de Dieu contre les sept fois purifiés." However, considering the overwhelming likelihood that מזוקקי שבעתים refers to righteous humanity, I prefer to read them as an object of God's sanctification.

(71) Against the translations of Nitzan (*Qumran Prayer*, 242), G. Vermes (*The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [5<sup>th</sup> ed.; New York: Allen Lane/Penguin Press, 1997], 422), and B. Frennsson ("In a Common Rejoicing": *Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran* [SSU 14; Uppsala: University of Uppsala Press, 1999], 74), the *hiph'il* form of the root קדש takes a direct object in the accusative (see GKC §119). Therefore the *bet* in במזוקקי ובקדושים should be understood in the sense "among." For this reading, see Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Vol. 6*, 185; J. Davila, "Heavenly Ascents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. J. VanderKam and P. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999) 2:479, n. 48.

(72) With Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 242, n. 63, I read this word as a *niph'al* of the root ברר.

(73) Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 276, n. 12; cf. Baillet, DJD VII, 238.

that, as in the vast majority of its occurrences in the Scrolls, to be understood as referring to angelic beings. (74) Thus, the select humans and angels together are made by God into “an eternal sanctuary.” (75) This liturgical temple is characterized in line 5 by praises of “wondrous marvels” offered by the unified angelic and human community.

My suggestion that the conjoined liturgical community of righteous humans and angels are the subject of the verb יהללוהו at the beginning of line 5 is supported by the terse language of lines 3-4. “They shall be priests, his righteous people, his host, and ministers, the angels of his glory.” According to my translation, line 4 contains a list of epithets referring to a single conjoined community of earthly and heavenly priests. (76) As such, together in liturgical communion, this temple-community, envisioned as comprised of priests, humans, and angels, offers the praise of “wondrous marvels” mentioned in line 5. (77)

While this passage lacks mention of an exalted individual mediator, it does parallel the situation observed in the canticles of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*. Indeed, within a liturgical context, the earthly community is envisioned as exalted and participating with the angels in glorious praise of God. However, here the experience is stated in explicitly priestly terms.

(74) See, e.g., J.J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 313-17. However, note the phrase “for the holy ones of his people” (לקדושי עמו) in 4Q511 2 I, 6, which may refer to human beings. On the other hand, in 4Q400 1 I, 6, the context strongly implies that the term עם refers to angelic priests. Another possible use of the term עם for angels appears in IQM 12:8.

(75) Davila (“Heavenly Ascents,” 479) notes that according to this text, “some, but not all, of the members of the sect would achieve apotheosis at the eschaton to serve as priests in the heavenly temple alongside the angels.” According to his translation, the same should also apply to the angels. It remains unclear to me why here only some of the righteous should be sanctified as an eternal temple. In IQS 8-9, the whole community enjoys that privilege.

(76) For the controversy surrounding the translation of this difficult line, see Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 128-32.

(77) The depiction of the eternal temple (מקדש עולמים) of 4Q511 35 3 as embodied by priests, people, and angels of his glory among others, and offering praises to God with “wondrous marvels” is paralleled vividly by the description of the animate temple in the seventh song of Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: “That there may be wondrous songs (sung) with eter[nal] joy. With these let all the foundations of the holly of holies praise, the supporting pillars of the supremely lofty abode, and all the corners of its structure” (באלה יהללו כל יסודי קודש) (4Q403 1 I, 40-41). Cf. IQS 11:8, where we are told that the סוד מבנית קודש is composed of the community of men and angels joined together by God (ועם בני שמים חבר סודם לעצת יחד).



*IQSb 4*

A much closer parallel with the *Self-Glorification Hymn* may be observed in another sectarian liturgical work to be recited by the Maskil—the set of blessings directed toward various individual eschatological leaders and groups known as *IQSb*. Although these blessings appear to have been composed for the eschatological assembly, it is generally held that they were recited proleptically in the Qumran community, which certainly lived out the belief that it was living on the fringes of the eschatological age. (78) The relevant passage for our purpose appears in the blessing of the high priest preserved in *IQSb* 4:22-28. (79)

22 And may he make you more righteous than all r[...] he chose you[ 23 and to raise up the head of the holy ones, and your people to bl[ess...]your *brt* in your hand 24 the men of God's council, and not by the hand of a prince [...] by each man for his fellow. 25 And (may) you (be) like an angel of the presence in the holy dwelling for the glory of the God of host[s (ואתה כמלאך פנים במעון קודש לכבוד אלהי צבא[ות])...] May you] be round about serving in the temple of the 26 kingship (ומפיל גורל עם מלאכי פנים) (ת[היה סביב משרת בהיכל מלכות] and the council of the community (ועצת יחד [...]for] eternal time and for all perpetual periods. Because 27 [true (are) all] his [p]recepts. May he make you hol[y] among his people, and for a light (וישימכה קוד[ש] בעמו ולמאור) [...] to the world with knowledge and to illuminate the face of the many (לתבל בדעת) (ולהאיר פני רבים) 28 [...] a diadem for the holy of holies, because [...]you are made hol[y] for him, and shall glorify his name and his holy things.

It is especially noteworthy that lines 25-26 call for the priestly addressee to be “like an angel of the presence in the holy dwelling for the glory of the God of host[s...and] be round about serving in the temple of the kingship casting the lot with the angels of the presence and the council of the community [...]for] eternal time and for all perpetual periods.” Much like the *Canticles of Michael and the Right-*

(78) See, e.g., Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 141; Zimmerman, *Messianische Texte*, 284. Cf. L. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989); M. Abegg, “1QSb and the Elusive High Priest,” in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 3-16.

(79) Text and translations of *IQSb* generally follow J. Charlesworth and L. Stuckenbruck, in J. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (PTSDSSP 1; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck); Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 126-29.

eous, this passage envisions an exalted human figure comparable to the angels as well as an earthly community in a liturgical context. We may note further that this passage appears to break down the ontological boundary between the earthly community members and the angels through the intermediation of the exalted human priest. This is evident from the second activity attributed to the high priest in line 26, namely, the casting of the lot with the angels of the presence and the council of the community. It is not exactly clear what is meant by “casting the lot,” although the phrase seems to be connected to the determination of cosmic fate. (80) Regardless, in bidding the addressee to cast the lot with both the angels of the presence *and* the *עצת יחד*, (81) the passage implies that the high priest is participating with both groups. (82) This is not to say that he is in two places at once, above and below, but that, as envisioned in the liturgy, he has accessed the celestial temple and participates there with the angels and the enlightened community.

A related picture appears in the blessing of the Zadokite Priests in the previous column of *IQSb*:

22 Words of blessing for the M[askil to bless] the Sons of Zadok, the priests whom 23 God chose to strengthen his covenant [...] all his precepts in the midst of his people and to teach them 24 as he commanded. And they raised up in truth [...] and watched over all of his statutes in righteousness and walked just a[s] 25 he chose. May the Lord bless you from his [ho]ly [dwelling] (יִבְרַכְכָּה אֱדוּנֵי מִ[מַּעַן קוֹן־דָּשֵׁר]). May he set you as a splendid ornament in the midst of 26 the holy ones (וְיִשְׁמַכְהָ מִכְלֹאֵי), and [may he r]enew for you the covenant of the [eternal] priesthood (וּבְרִית כְּהוֹנָתָן עוֹלָם יְהִי־דָשׁ לָכֶּה), and may he give you your place in the 27 holy [dwelling] (וְיִתְּנֶכָה מִקוֹמָכָה בְּמַעַן קוֹדֵשׁ).

(80) In *IQS* 4:26, as well as several other places in the Scrolls (cf. *4Q181* 1 II, 5; *IQM* 13:9-10; *4Q418* 81 5), God appears to be the one who “casts the lot,” i.e., determines the fate of human beings. See further A. Lange, “The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998* (ed. D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E.M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 39-43. If the high priest is given this privilege here, he may be being portrayed as God’s agent within creation and history. See further Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 152-3. For an alternative explanation see J. Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim: mi-Megillot Midbar Yehudah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 285.

(81) As a reference to the Qumran community, this phrase appears overwhelmingly in the form *עצת היחד*. However, the form *עצת יחד* does occur several times, apparently with the exact same meaning. Cf. *IQSa* 1:26; *IQS* 3:2, 11:8; *4Q257* III, 3. For more on the meaning of the term *עצה* at Qumran, see J. Worrell, “*עצה*: ‘Counsel’ or ‘Council’ at Qumran?” *VT* 20 (1970): 65-74.

(82) So Wolfson, “Seven Mysteries,” 210-11.

The Zadokite priests, of course, are the same group that appears to lead the Qumran community both in the present and the future age, at least according to parts of the *Rules of the Community and the Congregation*. (83) If we accept Milik's plausible suggestions for line 25 and the end of line 26, then the *מעון קודש*, the place from which God sets forth his blessing in line 25, is the very same place where the earthly Zadokite priests are called to take their God-granted place among the "holy ones" in lines 26-27. (84) Considering the occurrence and use of the same phrase *מעון קודש* in *IQSb* 4:25, this is plausibly a reference to the participation of the Zadokite priests with the angels serving in the celestial temple. This use of the phrase *מעון קודש*, of course, brings us back to the *Canticles of Michael and the Righteous*, where we are told not only that the speaker has a portion in the *מעון הקודש* (Recension B, ll. 14-15), but also that the earthly righteous are to give praise and sing to God there (l. 20). The parallel language and themes in the explicitly priestly experience of the celestial temple by the exalted mediator and earthly community in *IQSb* lend plausibility to the suggestion that a similar priestly perspective lies behind the canticles of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*.

## Conclusion

While scholars have been correct to characterize the speaker of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* as "eschatological," the above evidence militates against those who would claim that he is a figure strictly reserved for the future. Indeed, the liturgical context, as well as the close affinity between the speaker and the righteous worshippers, indicates that he is most likely a member of the Qumran community who should be considered "eschatological" only inasmuch as the liturgical experience disrupted ordinary time and ontological barriers. While no ascent to heaven is expressed in the text, the homology drawn between the speaker and the righteous worshippers implies that he leads them to an experience of heavenly glorification comparable to his own. This is evident particularly in the protagonist's call for them to give praise "in the holy dwelling" (Recension B, l. 20), the very same place where he has assumed a position among the angels (ll. 14-15). Interpreted in the light of the phrase "holy dwelling" as it appears in *IQSb*, the speaker is calling for community members to join him in participation with the angels as priests in the celestial temple, the imperishable realm of the spiritual worship of God. Given the Hymn's numerous

(83) See *IQS* 5:2, 9; *IQSa* 1:2, 24; 2:3.

(84) J.T. Milik, in D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 124.

connections with several other documents discovered at Qumran that describe elevated priestly figures, as well as the unequivocal centrality of priestly identity in the communal liturgical exaltation expressed in *4QSongs of the Sage* and *IQSb*, this interpretation becomes all the more plausible.

Finally, it should be noted that none of the above evidence requires that the author or the performers of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* were hereditary priests (though it obviously does not exclude the possibility). The evidence does, however, certainly point to the centrality in Qumranite theology of the cosmic temple as a symbol of both God's eternal sovereignty and the apex of the community's spiritual achievement.

Joseph ANGEL

# DAVID AS ONE OF THE “PERFECT OF (THE) WAY”:

## On the Provenience of *David’s Compositions* (and *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* as a Whole?)\*

### *Summary*

The present study takes another look at the debate surrounding the “sectarian” vs. “canonical” nature of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* (*11Q5*). It specifically investigates the question of possible sectarian terminology in *David’s Compositions* (*DavComp*), focusing particularly on the comment expressed there that David was “perfect in all his ways.” A comparison of this terminology with its pattern of use elsewhere in the Qumran literature suggests that it reflects a sectarian presentation of David and, thus, of *DavComp* as a whole. If correct, this would in turn have impact on the understanding of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* as a whole, given the importance usually ascribed to *DavComp* in the debate over the nature of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*.

### 1. The “Great *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* Debate”: The Provenience of *11Q5*

As is well known, *David’s Compositions* (*DavComp*) is one of five passages in the great Psalms scroll from Cave 11 (*11Q5* = *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*) containing material not otherwise known prior to the discovery of Qumran. (1) The fact that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* contained these

\* My thanks go to the following individuals for reading and commenting on the essay: S. A. Berg, C. D. Elledge, E. Puech, and H. W. M. Rietz.

(1) In addition to *DavComp*, these are *Plea for Deliverance*, *Hymn to the Creator*, *Apostrophe to Zion*, and *A Doxology* (the latter is something of a pastiche of phrases familiar from elsewhere and so often not reckoned as important as the others). See James A. Sanders with J. H. Charlesworth and H. W. L. Rietz, “Non-Masoretic Psalms (4Q88=4QPs<sup>f</sup>, 11Q5=11QPs<sup>a</sup>, 11Q6=11QPs<sup>b</sup>),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, Vol. 4A: *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (PTSDSSP 4A; eds. J. H. Charles-

heretofore unattested compositions, along with the fact that the scroll also contained four psalms known elsewhere only from other ancient translations (*viz.*, *Psalms* 151, 154, 155; and *Sir* 51:13-30), has often figured into the debate regarding the provenience of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* as a whole. It was quickly seen, that is, that these “non-biblical” (2) pieces of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* impinged on the nature of the entire manuscript.

The original editor of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*, James A. Sanders, was quick to see that the manuscript posed important questions regarding the question of canon(icity) at Qumran. (3) Sanders himself posited that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* was a legitimate (true, scriptural, canonical) psalter at Qumran, compiled and legitimated by those who lived there; thus, “the Qumran Psalter.” (4) Peter W. Flint dubbed Sanders’ proposals about *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* the “Qumran Psalms Hypothesis,” and has mounted the most significant attempt to prove it in a vast number of publications. (5) Since Flint’s work began as a dissertation under Eugene C. Ulrich, it is not surprising to note that Ulrich, too, has favored the Sanders-Flint

worth and H. W. L. Rietz, *et al.*; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck and Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 158-61, 193-205, 213-15; and the earlier editions in James A. Sanders, *DJD* 4:76-79, 85-93; and *idem*, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), 119-37. Parts of these compositions are found in other Psalms MSS: *4Q88* (*4QPs<sup>f</sup>*) 7.14-8.15 preserves a portion of the *Apostrophe to Zion* (see PTS DSSP 4A:203-5); while *11Q6* (*11QPs<sup>b</sup>*) preserves portions of *A Doxology* (*11Q6* frg. f) and *Plea for Deliverance* (*11Q6* frags. a-b). See PTS DSSP 4A:158-61, 192-97, respectively.

(2) For the language of “non-biblical,” see note 12 below.

(3) See, *e.g.*, James A. Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 10-14; *idem*, “*Variorum* in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>),” *HTR* 59 (1966): 83-94; *idem*, “Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon,” *McCormick Quarterly* 21 (1968): 1-15, repr. in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology* (eds. David Noel Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield; Garden City: Doubleday, 1969), 101-16; and *idem*, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) Reviewed,” in *On Language, Culture, and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida* (eds. M. Black and W. A. Smalley; The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 79-99.

(4) At first, Sanders believed that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* was the product of the Qumran Community. He later revised this opinion, stating that it was brought to the site from elsewhere, perhaps as part of the property given to the library by an initiate. See note 31 below.

(5) See, *e.g.*, Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997), *passim*, esp. 8 on the hypothesis; *idem*, “The Contribution of the Cave 4 Psalms Scrolls to the Psalms Debate,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 320-33; *idem*, “The ‘11QPs<sup>a</sup>-Psalter’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Including the Preliminary Edition of 4QPs<sup>e</sup>,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (eds. C. A. Evans and S. Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 173-99; and *idem*, “Psalms and Psalters in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (3 vols.; ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:233-72.

perspective. (6) The notion that multiple Psalters may have coexisted at Qumran, or, at least, that the text of the Psalter was still in flux in this period, well fits Ulrich's theory of multiple literary editions and his understanding of the state of the biblical text in Early Judaism around the turn of the eras. (7)

There are, of course, dissenting voices. These include such notables as Shemaryahu Talmon, (8) Patrick W. Skehan, Menahem Haran, Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, Ben Zion Wacholder, Emanuel Tov, and, most recently, Ulrich Dahmen. (9) This opposition to the "Qumran

(6) See Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 201 and nn. 151-53 for the influence of Ulrich and the change from Flint's earlier position favoring a Qumran origin of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* (in his original dissertation) to his current belief (expressed in the published monograph and subsequent studies) that the "*11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter" "was almost certainly compiled prior to the Qumran period and is representative of more widespread groups for whom the solar calendar was authoritative" (ibid., 201). See also the next note and further below at notes 21-22 and the discussion there.

(7) See, e.g., Eugene C. Ulrich, "Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology Thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls," *CBQ* 66 (2004): 1-24; and the essays collected in *idem*, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), esp. 3-120. One foundational issue that seems un(der)addressed in Ulrich's seminal work is whether *coexistence* of diverse literary editions means the same thing as *co-importance*. The equation of these two could at least be challenged if not completely doubted. At the very least, their equation is not self-evident. Cf. §4 below.

(8) Shemaryahu Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *Textus* 5 (1966): 11-21. Sanders reports that Talmon expressed a change of opinion in an oral presentation given in 1973, subsequently agreeing with Sanders' perspective ("The Qumran Psalms Scroll [11QPs<sup>a</sup>] Reviewed," 96). However, I am unable to locate a publication where Talmon himself put this change of opinion in print. Instead, from his review of Flint (*JBL* 118 [1999]: 545-47), it appears that he has not changed his opinion much, if any, from his earlier work. Note the following: "The argument [for gradual stabilization of the Psalter], however, is tenuous. Since only psalms from Psalm 101 onwards are preserved, it cannot be established whether or not additional compositions were included in its former part....It is probable, although not provable, that in the mainstream community the biblical Psalter of 150 songs had already then achieved a formative and textual fixity. The fragments of the book of Psalms from Masada and Naḥal Ḥever seemingly give witness to the existence of a proto-masoretic *textus receptus*" (547). For the scrolls from Masada and Naḥal Ḥever, see note 28 below.

(9) See, e.g., Patrick W. Skehan, "A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *CBQ* 35 (1973): 195-205; *idem*, "Qumran and Old Testament Criticism," in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris and Leuven: Éditions Duculot and Leuven University Press, 1978), 163-82; Menahem Haran, "11QPs<sup>a</sup> and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minḥah le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday* (eds. M. Brettler and M. Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 193-201; Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22-33; Ben Zion Wacholder, "David's Eschatological Psalter: 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *HUCA* 59 (1988): 23-72; Emanuel Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts



Psalms Hypothesis” believes, in the main, that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is a sectarian composition (or compilation)—a scroll used and useful in the life of the Community, probably for liturgical purposes, and thus a liturgical manuscript, but not a copy—in the text-critical sense—of the *Book of Psalms*. One might say, then, that while Sanders initiated the “Qumran Psalms Hypothesis,” and Flint and others—notably Gerald H. Wilson (10)—have carried out extensive experiments, the dissenters insist that the hypothesis remains unproven and thus hypothetical. The conversation is not yet closed, the “Great *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* Debate,” if we may call it such, is not yet concluded. (11)

## 2. The Role of *David’s Compositions* in the Debate

Interestingly, both sides of the debate have appealed to the “non-biblical” (12) portions of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* to support their positions. For the first group, the existence of these non-Masoretic compositions, along with other factors like different psalm orderings, proves that Qumran

from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 581-600; and Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs<sup>a</sup> aus Qumran* (STDJ 49; Leiden: Brill, 2003). Perhaps one should add here the comments of Frank Moore Cross, “The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert,” *HTR* 57 (1964): 281-99, esp. 286; reprinted in F. M. Cross and S. Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 177-96, esp. 182. Note also Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 165, who believes *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is a “liturgical text, not a literary collection like the canonical Book of Psalms.”

(10) See, e.g., Gerald H. Wilson, “The Qumran Psalms Manuscripts and the Consecutive Arrangement of Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter,” *CBQ* 45 (1983): 377-88; *idem*, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll Reconsidered: Analysis of the Debate,” *CBQ* 47 (1985): 624-42; *idem*, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), esp. 63-138; *idem*, “The Qumran *Psalms Scroll* (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) and the Canonical Psalter: Comparison of Editorial Shaping,” *CBQ* 59 (1997): 448-64.

(11) For fuller overviews of the debate, Wilson, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll Reconsidered,” 624-42; *idem*, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 63-92; Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, esp. 202-27; Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 12-24; Sanders, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) Reviewed,” esp. the bibliography on 80-83.

(12) Flint has been particularly adamant that such language is anachronistic for the Qumran Psalms evidence (see, e.g., *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 13-26). Following Sanders and Wilson, he prefers language of “MT-150” when speaking of the received, Masoretic Text, and explicitly avoids terms like “canon” and “canonical.” “Non-biblical” is used in the present study for heuristic purposes only and is not to be taken anachronistically as implying the existence of a fixed and stable canon (or Psalter), which is, of course, the whole problem or question in the first place. Cf. similarly Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 24-25.

had alternative text-forms for the Psalms or, at the very least, felt free to inject other “non-MT-150” (13) material into their Psalms manuscripts. Moreover, these text-forms (or text-practices) demonstrate that the last third or so of the Psalter was still very much in flux at the time of the Community’s existence. The opposition party, on the other hand, believes the existence of these self-same “inserts” or “additions” reveals that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* was not simply or purely a copy of the *Book of Psalms*; rather, it is a compilation—a combination of biblical and non-biblical material—sectarian in some way, probably for functional (especially liturgical) purposes. (14)

Who’s right? The debate is both wide and deep with much evidence to consider; the full scope of the many issues involved cannot be adequately covered let alone resolved here. Instead, I merely wish to point out a detail in *DavComp* that seems to have not been given sufficient attention in previous discussions, but is actually of great significance for the debate, since both sides are agreed that *DavComp* plays a crucial role in the manuscript and in arguments about its provenience. (15) This detail is David’s description as “perfect in all his ways before God and men,” which is found in *11Q5* 27.3.

*David’s Compositions (11Q5 27.2-11) (16)*

- 2 And David, the son of Jesse, was wise and a light like the light of the sun and a scribe
- 3 and discerning and perfect in all his ways before God and men (ותמים בכל דרכיו לפני אל ואנשים). And the LORD gave

(13) See previous note.

(14) See most recently and extensively, Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, *passim*, esp. 313-18. A somewhat unique position is offered by Wacholder, who believes the David of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is an eschatological one, making the scroll itself eschatological (“David’s Eschatological Psalter”). Cf. also Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 317.

(15) Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 22; Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 177. See, e.g., from the one perspective, Sanders *DJD* 4:75-76; Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 207-8; and, from the other, Skehan, “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” 168-69, who lists it among the factors that lead him to believe *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is “a library edition of the putative works of David” (169). Similarly, Talmon, “Pisqah Be’emša’ Pasuq,” 13, who thinks the inclusion of *DavComp* is explained by *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* being “a liturgical compilation,” or what he goes on to describe as “an incipient prayerbook.” Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll,” 26 n. 23 also understands *DavComp* as demonstrating the “liturgical character of the collection.”

(16) For the text, see *DJD* 4:48, 92 and Pl. XVI; Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 86, 136; and PTSDDSP 4A:214. Note that, prior to *DavComp*, *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* had David’s Last Words (2 *Sam* 23:1-7), only the last verse of which is extant in *11Q5* (in 27.1). After *DavComp*, the MS proceeds to *Psalms* 140. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 97, who reconstructs the scroll differently, places *DavComp* in his column 36.

- 4 to him a discerning and enlightened spirit. And he wrote
- 5 3,600 psalms. And songs for singing before the altar over the daily whole-burnt
- 6 *tamid*-offering, for every day of the year (totaled) 364.
- 7 And for the offerings of the Sabbaths: 52 songs. And for the offering of the New
- 8 Moons and for all the days of the festivals and for the Day of Atonement: 30 songs.
- 9 And all the songs that he spoke were 446. And songs
- 10 for making music over those stricken (were) 4. So, the total was 4,050.
- 11 All of these he spoke by prophecy which had been given to him from before the Most High. (17)

There is much grist for the *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* debate in this brief passage. In particular, the fact that the total number of days in the year is 364 and the total number of Sabbaths 52 suggests the solar calendar that appears to have been the dominant one used at Qumran. (18) While some scholars have said that the presence of the solar calendar here in *DavComp* is, by itself, enough evidence to demonstrate the sectarian nature of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*, (19) Flint has argued the exact opposite. He asserts, to the contrary, that because (a) this solar calendar was widely used in Early Judaism (witness *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*) and because (b) *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* reflects that calendar (via *DavComp* especially), (20) then it follows that (c) *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* represents a psalter-type that was widely used in Early Judaism. (21) If so, it further follows that (d) *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is far from a sectarian, “non-biblical” composition, secondary and inferior to the MT-150 Psalter. Instead, it is a “true, Scriptural” Psalter reflective of one shape of the Psalms in Early Judaism prior to the

(17) All translations are my own.

(18) See Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 172-201, esp. 182-86, 192-93; also and further, Michael Chyutin, “The Redaction of the Qumranic and the Traditional Book of Psalms as a Calendar,” *RevQ* 16 (1994): 367-95.

(19) See, e.g., Michaël N. van der Meer’s review of Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, in *JSJ* 30 (1999): 102; similarly, Wacholder, “David’s Eschatological Psalter,” 37; Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll,” 28.

(20) But not only in *DavComp*. Flint also appeals to the number of compositions (52 + 4 pieces asserting Davidic authorship) so that “the structure of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is in some way related to the solar calendar” (*The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 193; italics mine). The vagueness of this claim does not engender much confidence, nor do the facts that (a) the structure is calendrical + 4 more (*ibid.*, 192); and (b) the total number of psalms compositions rests on reconstruction of the MS (see *ibid.*, 189-92; for other reconstructions, see, e.g., Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*; and Chyutin, “The Redaction of the Qumranic and the Traditional Book of Psalms,” 367-95). Finally, the significance of the specifically solar nature of the scroll is never fully explained.

(21) E.g., Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 169, 201 (cited in note 6 above) and *passim*.

MT-150 form which only developed thereafter and later. Flint recommends that this improved understanding of the nature of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* be reflected in new nomenclature. He eschews Sanders' earlier terminology of "the Qumran Psalter," preferring instead to speak of the tradition (which he believes to be larger and anterior to Qumran) of the "*11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter." (22) Flint goes on to posit that this *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter might have actually been the dominant one prior to the rise of the MT-150 Psalter. At the very least, the *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter was a strong rival to the MT-150 Psalter, attesting to the gradual stabilization—or, more precisely, the two-stage, but three-edition development—of the Psalter in Early Judaism. (23)

Several observations might be made in response. For one, Carol A. Newsom has helpfully delineated that the sectarian status of a manuscript must be adjudicated in a number of ways. (24) Sectarian *composition* is just one of these ways, another is sectarian *reception and use*. In the case of the latter, the manuscript need not be sectarian in origin, nor must it include explicitly sectarian *terminology* (another sign of sectarian provenience). According to the categories of reception and use, for instance, the fact that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* was popular at Qumran—a point evidenced, in part, by overlaps with other manuscripts that suggest a shared text-type (25)—actually proves it is "sectarian," but, again, only for as long as that terminology is defined as "received and used by sectarians." (26)

(22) E.g., Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 198-201 and *passim*.

(23) E.g., Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 239 and *passim*. Note also Wilson, "The Qumran Psalms Scroll Reconsidered," 640-42 and the chart on 641.

(24) See Carol A. Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (eds. B. Halpern, W. H. Propp, and D. N. Freedman; BJSUCSD 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167-87.

(25) Specifically, *11QPs<sup>b</sup>* (*11Q6*) and *4QPs<sup>c</sup>* (*4Q87*). See Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 159-64, for a discussion. See also note 1 above for overlaps with *4Q88* (*4QPs<sup>f</sup>*). Contrary to Flint's frequent assertions (e.g., *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 208; similarly Sanders, "The Qumran Psalms Scroll [11QPs<sup>a</sup>] Reviewed," 95-96), multiple copies of a text-type does not disprove alternative interpretations of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* such as Skehan's or Goshen-Gottstein's. Multiple copies prove only the popularity of the "liturgical compilation" (if it is that). There are, after all, multiple copies of other non-biblical/sectarian compositions at Qumran. Cf. Brent A. Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran: Their Significance for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Socio-Religious History of the Qumran Community and its Literature," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Volume 2: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 107-67, esp. 153-57.

(26) Cf. the insights of Henry W. Morisada Rietz, "Identifying Compositions and Traditions of the Qumran Community: The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* as a Test Case," in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (eds. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 29-52.

Second, it may be doubted whether the number of compositions delineated in *DavComp*, the unit as a whole, or even the solar calendar reflected therein can bear the weight of Flint's argument. Flint may well be right about the "*11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter," but the steps (c and d) above that proceed directly from the solar calendar implied (but not necessarily enjoined—this is not a legal text) in *DavComp* (27) to *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* as a representative or widely-known psalter/tradition in Early Judaism writ large are not yet established nor yet definitive, especially given contrary evidence found at Qumran, Masada, and Naḥal Hever. (28) Indeed, at present *there is no non-Qumranic evidence for the "11QPs<sup>a</sup>-Psalter."* Surely this fact alone recommends extreme caution when generalizing about the wider role or status of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* (or its "tradition"—assuming there was one) outside Qumran. Moreover, while Qumran certainly did share the solar calendar with other Jewish groups, that fact does not necessarily make the Qumranites' use of such a calendar or of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* any less sectarian. It just makes the calendar itself not solely the property of Qumran. Again, one has to reckon, in Newsom's terms, not only with composition and explicit terminology, but also with reception and use. And by all accounts, the find-spot and the date of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* place this manuscript squarely at Qumran, which—again, by virtually all accounts—was very much a sect, even a highly exclusivist and radically isolated one.

Third, it is important to point out that one of Flint's major revisions to Sanders' hypothesis concerns precisely the provenience of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*. As noted above, Sanders was originally inclined toward the opinion that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* had been composed at Qumran, though he does leave the door open to a non- or pre-Qumranic origin already in his 1967 Cornell edition. (29) Flint has walked through that door and

(27) Again, for Flint, the solar-calendar nature of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* rests on other factors beyond *DavComp*. See note 20 above.

(28) For Qumran, consider the MSS that seem to support the MT-150 Psalter (though Flint is wont to downplay these; *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 157-58). At Masada, note esp. *MasPs<sup>b</sup>*; for Naḥal Hever, see *5/6Hev-Se4 Ps*. Cf. Talmon's review of Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, JBL 118 (1999): 547; and, for editions of the Masada scrolls: *idem*, "Hebrew Fragments from Masada," in *Masada VI: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965: Final Report* (eds. Joseph Aviram, Gideon Foerster, and Ehud Netzer; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Hebrew University, 1999), 76-97. But note also Eugene C. Ulrich's recent attempt to fit some of the Masada evidence into his broader theories: "Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts from Masada," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields, with the assistance of Eva Ben-David, VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 453-64.

(29) Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 11, 13, 134.

propped it open fully, arguing that, while the specific *manuscript* of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* was copied at Qumran, the *tradition* (the "*11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter") it represents was brought to Qumran from elsewhere, no doubt by one of the initiates to the Community. (30) A pre-Qumranic origin for the tradition would explain, on the one hand, the presence within *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* of compositions known from other ancient translations, and, on the other hand, how the manuscript might reflect other (or larger) groups within Early Judaism as a whole. Conversely, in the absence of a pre-Qumranic origin and importation of the tradition (or manuscript?) into the Community, it becomes far more difficult to argue for the wider use of or significance for that tradition (or manuscript?). Said differently, if *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*'s tradition is contemporaneous with the scroll's copying/composition (or if both are Qumranic even if not precisely contemporary), then it becomes much more difficult, if not impossible, to believe that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* reflects larger Jewish circles *outside* of Qumran. While that larger circle scenario *might* be possible, it becomes an entirely speculative proposition. It could also be stated that the belief that the *tradition* of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* as a whole—*qua* compilation, that is, not, of course, of every one of its constituent parts—was brought to Qumran from outside is also almost entirely a matter of conjecture. Nevertheless, under the influence of Flint's work, which he has warmly welcomed, Sanders has definitively revised his earlier thinking on this score, now believing that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* or its tradition was brought to Qumran from elsewhere. (31)

### 3. David as a "Perfect of (the) Way": The Significance of דרך + תמים in *David's Compositions*

Let it be repeated that, Flint, Sanders, *et al.* may well be right in their overall assessment, despite the significance of the contrarian observations noted above. But there is still one more observation to be made: it is a small but very important piece of evidence that suggests that *DavComp* may well be sectarian, not only in *reception* but

(30) See, *e.g.*, Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 199-200; *idem*, "Psalms and Psalters," 250. See also the next note.

(31) See, *e.g.*, Sanders in PTSDSSP 4A:213: "not necessarily composed at Qumran....If...not composed there, their beliefs about it would have apparently been shared by other Jews as well." Note further Sanders' review of Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, in *DSD* 6 (1999): 84-89. Sanders was already moving this direction; see *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 134; and esp. *idem*, "Psalm 154 Revisited," in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel für Norbert Lohfink S. J.* (eds. G. Braulik, W. Gross, and S. E. McEvenue; Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 296-306, esp. 301-302 and n. 22. Cf. Flint's discussion in *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 199-200 and note 4 above.

also in *composition*—even in *terminology*. That evidence is the particular use of דרך + תמים in *11Q5* 27.3. In addition to being “wise... and a scribe” (27.2), *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* indicates that David was “discerning and perfect in all his ways [ותמים בכול דרכיו] before God and men.”

This is a striking description in light of the pattern of usage regarding דרך + תמים elsewhere in Qumran literature. Indeed, far from a minor textual “aside,” a closer look at this particular combination reveals that it is widely used in sectarian compositions of the sectarians themselves, above all in the descriptor תמימי דרך. (32) This pattern of distinctive usage suggests that David’s description at this point in *11Q5* 27.3 is sectarian in origin and motivation. If so, this would have obvious and significant bearing on the provenience of *DavComp* and, perhaps, on the provenience of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* as a whole, given the widely-held import of *DavComp* for the scroll’s overall interpretation (see §2 above).

Before proceeding further on this point, however, we must reckon with the possibility that the language describing David in *11Q5* could simply derive, at least in part, from other texts about him in the Hebrew Bible. One thinks, for instance, of 2 *Sam* 22:24, 26, and 33 (// *Ps* 18:24, 26, 33). (33)

2 *Sam* 22:24: ואהיה תמים לו ואשתמרה מעוני.

*Ps* 18:24: ואהי תמים עמו ואשתמר מעוני.

“I was perfect before/with him and I kept myself from my iniquity.”

2 *Sam* 22:26: עם־חסיד תתחסד עם־גבור תמים תתמם.

*Ps* 18:26: עם־חסיד תתחסד עם־גבר תמים תתמם.

“With the faithful you are faithful, with the perfect hero/man you are perfect.”

(32) For the data, see most recently Brent A. Strawn with Henry W. Morisada Rietz, “(More) Sectarian Terminology in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*: The Case of תמימי דרך,” in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (eds. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 53-64. See also further below.

(33) It should be recalled that *DavComp* is preceded by 2 *Sam* 23:1-7, which follows immediately upon 2 *Samuel* 22 (// *Psalm* 18) in the MT. Sanders (*DJD* 4:92) opined that the latter “was surely included in the early columns of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*.” Later, in *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 10, he clarified his position by stating that *Psalm* 18 must have been contained in “the full Qumran Psalter,” making special appeal to *8QPs* (*8Q2*). See now also *4Q85* (*4QPs<sup>c</sup>*), *4Q98e* (*4QPs<sup>e</sup>*), *11Q7* (*11QPs<sup>c</sup>*), *11Q8* (*11QPs<sup>d</sup>*); and cf. *Seiyal* 4 and *MasPs<sup>a</sup>*—all of which contain portions of *Psalm* 18. As for *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* itself, however, Flint follows Skehan in arguing that the MS probably began with *Psalm* 101 (*The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 41).



2 Sam 22:33: (34) האל מעוזי חיל ויתר תמים דרכו.  
 Ps 18:33: האל המאורני חיל ויתן תמים דרכי

(See discussion below.)

In the first verse, David describes himself as תמים. In the second, God is so described, by means of the verbal form, along with the one who is similarly תמים. (35) David is not explicitly called תמים in this second instance, though it is possible that it also has him in mind, following as quickly as it does on the first instance. Regardless, it is only the third verse that explicitly conjoins תמים with דרך. (36) Unfortunately, the parallel texts diverge rather markedly here and the sense of the last clause, in particular, is far from clear. (37) The Kethib of 2 Sam 22:33 makes matters worse by reading the 3ms suffix on דרך, raising the possibility that it is *God's* way that is under discussion here, not David's. (38) In sum, then, 2 Samuel 22 // Psalm 18 has little to offer by way of help or precedent for *DavComp's* particular description of David as תמים בכול דרכיו. (39)

(34) So Kethib, Qere reads דרכי ("my way"). Cf. Ps 18:33.

(35) Perhaps one should compare, as conceptually related, 11Q19 60.21: תמים תהיה עם יהוה אלוהיכה ("you shall be perfect with the LORD your God"); Lev 19:2: קדשים תהיה כי קדוש אני יהוה אלהיכם ("you shall be holy, for I, the LORD your God, am holy"); or even Matt 5:48: ἑσέσθε οὖν ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν ("Therefore, be perfect, as your heavenly father is perfect") or Luke 6:36: Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν ("Be compassionate just as [also] your father is compassionate").

(36) Sanders, *DJD* 4:93, remarks that v. 33 "perhaps gave rise to תמים בכול דרכיו here" in *DavComp*. For problems with such a position, see further below. See also note 40 below for other, arguably more important biblical passages that conjoin דרך and תמים.

(37) Cf., e.g., NRSV:

- "The God who has girded me with strength [text-note: God is my strong refuge] has opened wide my path" (2 Sam 22:33);
  - "the God who girded me with strength, and made my way safe" (Ps 18:32).
- with NJPSV:
- "The God, my mighty stronghold, Who kept my path secure" (2 Sam 22:33);
  - "the God who girded me with might, who made my way perfect" (Ps 18:33).

See further the standard commentaries.

(38) Note esp. 2 Sam 22:31a: האל תמים דרכו. Cf. also Deut 32:4a: הצור תמים פעלו.

(39) Somewhat strangely, Sanders indicates that "[s]everal of the attributes of David listed in ll. 2-4 [of *DavComp*] are found in II Sam 23<sup>1-7</sup>" (*DJD* 4:92). But, other than David's PN and patronymic, and the mention of the spirit of the LORD, this claim cannot be well established. Elsewhere, Sanders includes 2 Samuel 22 along with 1 Sam 16:12-23; 2 Samuel 14; and 23:1-7 (*The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 134 and 137 n. 1) in making the claim.

There are, however, a number of other biblical passages that conjoin תמים and דרך that are more promising. (40) *Psalm* 119:1 comes immediately to mind:

אשרי תמימי־דרך ההלכים בתורת יהוה

“Blessed are those whose way is perfect, who walk in the Torah of the LORD”

as does *Prov* 11:20:

תועבת יהוה עקש־לב ורצונו תמימי דרך

“Those with crooked hearts are an abomination to the LORD, but the perfect of way are his delight.”

Unfortunately, or rather, tellingly, these other passages have little if anything to do with David. (41) The point, then, is that while there may well be biblical precedent for the *Qumran usage* of תמים + דרך, there is precious little evidence to suggest a biblical precedent for *David’s description* as “perfect in all his ways.”

There is, however, ample *Qumran precedent* for this description of David. Indeed, regardless of whether or not the ultimate origins or inspiration of the Qumranic collocation of תמים and דרך may be found or traced in the Bible, it is a well-attested fact that the Community used it frequently and used it frequently of itself. A full listing of the passages that collate the adjective תמים with the noun דרך has appeared recently and need not be repeated here. (42) It suffices to observe, on the basis of that list, that every attestation that conjoins דרך and תמים at Qumran and that can be meaningfully translated occurs in documents that are closely related to the Community, its theology, and its ideology. Moreover, the particular construction דרך תמימי occurs

(40) For דרך with תמים, see *Ezek* 28:15; *Pss* 101:2, 6; 119:1; *Prov* 10:29; 11:20; 13:6; and *Job* 4:6. Cf. also LXX *Ps* 36:18 [MT 37:18]; and *Prov* 10:9; 11:5; 28:6, 18. See further HALOT 4:1742-43, 1748-50. Of these, *Psalm* 101 may have been particularly generative for Qumran usage (note that Flint’s reconstruction of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* begins with *Ps* 101; *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 190). *Psalm* 119:1 and *Prov* 11:20 are particularly important, and are cited below, because they are the only instances in the Hebrew Bible of the specific phrase דרך תמימי.

(41) The only explicit Davidic connections in the list in the previous note are the superscriptions to *Psalm* 36 LXX and *Psalm* 101.

(42) See Strawn with Rietz, “(More) Sectarian Terminology,” 54-57 (further 53-64 for implications for the provenience of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*). The listing there is taken from M. G. Abegg, Jr., J. E. Bowley, and E. M. Cook, in consultation with E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, Vol. 1: *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2:764-66; and J. H. Charlesworth *et al.*, eds., *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck] and Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 112-13, 125.

*exclusively* in documents that are clearly Qumranic compositions. Still further, the majority of passages that conjoin דרך and תמים are found in the *Rule of the Community* (IQS, 4QS). (43) To be sure, תמים by itself is not a sectarian term. The use of תמים alone is not a sufficient criterion to indicate sectarian provenience. Proof of this point can be found in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> itself, particularly in 18.1 and 22.8, both of which use תמים in Psalm 154 and the *Apostrophe to Zion*, respectively. In both of these cases, however, תמים notably occurs *without* דרך. These instances may actually then prove the point that the construction דרך + תמים *is* sectarian, since "the vast majority of occurrences appear in documents that are either Qumran compositions or traditions that significantly influenced the Community." (44) Instances of דרך + תמים that occur within clearly Qumranic compositions include the *Rule of the Community* (IQS 2.2; 3.9-10; 4.22; 8.10, 18, 21; 9.2, 5, 9 // 4QpapS<sup>a</sup> frg. 2 line 5; 4QpapS<sup>c</sup> frg. 1 2.13; 4QS<sup>d</sup> frg. 3 line 3), the *Rule of the Congregation* (IQSa 1.28), the *Blessings* (IQSb 5.22), the *War Scroll* (IQM 14.7 // 4Q491 [4QM1] frags. 8-10 1.5), and the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (IQH<sup>a</sup> 9.36). The *Songs of the Master*, which also contains דרך and תמים (4Q510 [4QShir<sup>a</sup>] frg. 1 line 9 // 4Q511 [4QShir<sup>b</sup>] frg. 10 line 8; 4Q511 frg. 63 3.2-3), are also probably Qumranic. (45) The other instances occur in the *Damascus Document* (CD MS A 2.15-16; 4Q266 [4QD<sup>a</sup>] frg. 2 1.4; frg. 5 1.19), which is closely related to the Community and may reflect a branch of the movement; in *Instruction* (4Q418 = 4QInstruction<sup>d</sup> frg. 172 line 4) and in *Beatitudes* (4Q525 frags. 11-12 line 3; quite broken) – both of which probably reflect traditions inherited by Qumran. (46) This leaves unmentioned only the instances of דרך תמימי in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q403 frg. 1 1.22; 4Q404 frg. 2 line 3; 4Q405 frg. 13 line 6). Although the provenience of this latter composition has been debated, the other instances of the specific construction דרך תמימי

(43) See Strawn with Rietz, "(More) Sectarian Terminology," 57-58, who point out that 18 out of the 80 instances (22.5%) of תמים in the Qumran library come from IQS. The 4QS parallels add 10 more hits, bringing the total to 28 out of 80 hits (or 30%). The next closest documents are CD/4QD (12 hits; 15%) and the *Temple Scroll* (11Q19-20; 7 hits; 8.75%), but not all of these latter are relevant (see *ibid.*, 57-58 n. 19), further underscoring the dominance of this language in the *Serekh* texts.

(44) Strawn with Rietz, "(More) Sectarian Terminology," 60.

(45) See Newsom, "Sectually Explicit," 167-87.

(46) See Strawn with Rietz, "(More) Sectarian Terminology," 60; further Rietz, "Identifying Compositions and Traditions." Note that J. C. R. de Roo has argued that 4Q525 is a Qumran composition ("Is 4Q525 a Qumran Sectarian Document?" in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* [eds. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997], 338-67). Cf. E. Puech in *DJD* 25:119, who argues instead that it is a tradition that influenced Qumran.

occur exclusively in Qumran compositions as a technical term designating the Community itself. (47) This, along with other considerations, lends weight to the perspective that the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, too, are sectarian in the sense that they were composed at Qumran. (48)

As for the specific phrase used in *DavComp*, “perfect in all his ways” (תמים בכול דרכיו), it occurs elsewhere with this orthography only in *IQS* (see also *CD* MS A 2:15-16 below):

- *IQS* 2.2: “the men of God’s lot, those walking perfectly in all his ways (תמים בכול דרכיו).”

The suffix on דרכים in *IQS* certainly refers to God whereas in *DavComp* it refers to David himself, (49) though *DavComp* quickly indicates that this perfection was “before God and men” (לפני אל) (ואנשים). Closely-related phrases are found elsewhere only in the *Rule of the Community* (*IQS* and *4QpapS<sup>a</sup>*), *IQSb*, the *Damascus Document*, and *Beatitudes*:

- *IQS* 3.9-10 (// *4Q255* [*4QpapS<sup>a</sup>*] frg. 2 line 5): “May he establish his steps by walking perfectly in all the ways of God (תמים בכול דרכי אל).”
- *IQSb* 5.22: “and to walk before him (i.e., God) perfectly in all [the] way[s] of God” ([תמים בכול דר]כי אל).
- *CD* MS A 2.15-16: “and choose that which he (i.e., God) desires and reject that which he hates by walking perfectly in all his ways (תמים בכל דרכיו).”
- *4Q525* (*4QBeatitudes*) frgs. 11-12 line 3: “[...] perfect in all my way(s) (תמים בכול דרכי[]).”

The provenience of the latter two compositions has already been discussed above; neither raises significant problem for seeing in the particular conjunction of דרך + תמים a specifically Qumranic collocation. In fact, “fuller” passages like those found in texts from *IQS*, *4QS*, *IQSb*, and *CD*, which typically clarify that the דרך or דרכים in question belong to God, probably lie behind the shorter forms: תמים

(47) See Strawn with Rietz, “(More) Sectarian Terminology,” 61-62; cf. Carol A. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 202; *idem*, *DJD* 11:265; and James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (ECDSS 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 121-22.

(48) See Strawn with Rietz, “(More) Sectarian Terminology,” 53-64; Rietz, “Identifying Compositions and Traditions,” esp. 42-52. For the relationship between the *Sabbath Songs* and *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*, see also Wacholder, “David’s Eschatological Psalter,” 38-39.

(49) But cf. the Kethib/Qere issue in 2 *Sam* 22:33 (see note 34 above).

דרך, תמימי דרך, or בתמים דרך + הלך. The "perfect one(s) of (the) way," "those whose way is perfect," "to walk in/with/among the perfect of (the) way," and so forth, are likely dependent, that is, on the fuller notion that the way (דרך) is ultimately God's Way. The "perfect" (תמים), in turn, become "the Perfect"—a technical term for the Community and its adherents.

Given this significant, widely-attested, and specifically Qumranic usage of תמים + דרך, it would seem that the instance of the same collocation in *DavComp* has significant ramifications for its provenience. Assuming that these various uses are somehow related, it becomes extremely unlikely to posit that the route of influence (assuming there was one) would have run from *DavComp* to the other instances of תמים + דרך at Qumran. On the contrary, given the number of instances elsewhere and the particular range and pattern of use, it is far more probable that any possible influence would have run *from* these other compositions—sectarian, Qumranic compositions, let it be underscored—to *DavComp*. (50)

This point receives further confirmation by the paleographic *dates of the manuscripts* in question. *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is dated by Sanders and Flint to 30-50 CE; (51) the other manuscripts that appear to support the "11QPs<sup>a</sup>-Psalter" at Qumran, namely, *11QPs<sup>b</sup>* and *4QPs<sup>e</sup>* date to the very same horizon. (52) *1QS* (along with *1QSa* and *1QSB*), by contrast, dates to 125-50 BCE, while *4QpapS<sup>a</sup>* is paleographically quite early, written in a Mid-Hasmonean script dating to 125-100 BCE. (53) *Dates of traditions*, are, of course, quite another matter—by no means necessarily coterminous with the dates of the specific manuscripts that bear them. However, dating traditions is notoriously difficult, hardly self-evident or widely agreed upon, and frequently speculative. (54)

(50) One should not overlook the fact that תמים + דרך occurs primarily in the Community's disciplinary (legal) and doxological (liturgical) writings. This has bearing on, and clear relationship with, the content and tone of *DavComp*.

(51) Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 39; Sanders, *DJD* 4:9; *idem*, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 10. Cf. Brian Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," *DJD* 39:374, 426, who puts *11Q5* more generally at 1-50 CE. Cf. also the next two notes.

(52) *Viz.*, the first half of the first century CE (Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 41); and mid-first century CE (*ibid.*, 34; Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Peter W. Flint in *DJD* 16:74), respectively. Cf. Webster, *DJD* 39:374-75, 412, 430: 30-1 BCE (*11Q6*) and 30-68 CE (*4Q87*).

(53) See, conveniently, Webster in *DJD* 39:372, 390, 392 (*1QS*, *1QSa*, *1QSB*); and 372, 385 (*4QpapS<sup>a</sup>*). *4Q525* dates to 50-1 BCE (*DJD* 39:372, 409).

(54) See §2 above. As an example, one might note Wacholder, "David's Eschatological Psalter," 61, who dates the autograph of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* to "around the turn of the era or perhaps a few decades earlier." However, he dates the tradition of *DavComp* much earlier, "between the production of 11Q Torah...and the composition of the

The dates for the manuscripts themselves are a good bit more secure, even if they provide us with only a minimum base from which to work. (55) Complicating the issue with *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*, of course, is that the work is composite—a compilation: parts of it may well and certainly do date to different times. (56)

#### 4. Conclusion: David in Qumran Dress, *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* in Sectarian Perspective

To sum up: when the use of *תמים + דרך* in *DavComp* is considered along with the numerous and stereotypical instances of that collocation elsewhere in Qumran literature, David's description as "perfect in all his ways" begins to look like a datum pertinent to, if not actually indicative of, the origin and provenience of *DavComp*. In a word, David begins to look like a Qumran Covenanter himself—like one of the *תמימי דרך*, one of the "Perfect of (the) Way," perhaps even paradigmatically so. (57) At the very least, David looks as if he has

Damascus Covenant" (64), and later writes that "the final compilation of the scroll took place during the first half of the second century B.C.E., not long after the appearance of the latter proto-sectarian works" (72). Cf. William Hugh Brownlee, "The Significance of 'David's Compositions,'" *RevQ* 5 (1966): 569-74, who in passing suggests a date as early as the third century BCE for *DavComp* (571) but without offering any support for such a position. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll," 26 n. 21 remarks that only a very early date would make Sanders' thesis "somewhat more acceptable," though he himself does not subscribe to such a date, nor to Sanders' thesis.

(55) Cf., e.g., Philip S. Alexander, "The Redaction-History of *Serekh Ha-Yahad*: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437-56, who relies heavily on the paleographic dating of the MSS in question to interpret the textual history of the *Rule of the Community*. Flint skirts the problem by saying that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* *qua* manuscript was copied at Qumran for the use of the Community but that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* *qua* tradition is prior to Qumran, esp. in groups holding to the solar calendar (*The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 200-201). But, again, this is largely unverifiable (or unfalsifiable) and speculative. See the discussion above (esp. §2).

(56) This means, of course, that the date of one portion is not necessarily determinative for the whole. Cf. Sanders, "Cave 11 Surprises," 294; and Wilson, "The Qumran Psalms Scroll Reconsidered," 639-40. A particularly important section of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* on this score is the material from *Ben Sira* (see Haran, "11QPs<sup>a</sup> and the Canonical Book of Psalms," 199 n. 2, 201). Some have argued, however, that this unit circulated independently of *Ben Sira*, so that its inclusion in *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is not a firm datum for the latter's date. See, e.g., Wacholder, "David's Eschatological Psalter," 68-69.

(57) Cf. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 254: "Vor allem aber ist *דרך תמים* klassische Eigenbezeichnung und anzustrebendes Ideal der Qumrangemeinschaft"; 256: "In alledem erweist sich David als *תמים*; und das ist auch das Ideal der Mitglieder der Qumrangemeinschaft." But see *ibid.*, 257 for arguments for a pre-Qumranic status for *DavComp* and its Qumranic redaction.

been robed in the Qumranites' rhetorical garb. (58) If this be granted, two conclusions seem to follow:

1. First, given the literary integrity of the unit, *DavComp* as a whole begins to look more and more like a Qumran composition. It is not just David who is covered in Qumran veneer, so is *David's Compositions*. David's description there as תמים בכול דרכיו, in Qumranic context, lends support to the position that *DavComp*, at least, is a sectarian composition. This is no small point as Flint has explicitly made much of the *absence* of sectarian terminology in his argument for the pre-Qumranic compilation of the *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter. (59) But David as "a perfect of way" is, in fact, *precisely* such a "sectually explicit" term, to borrow from Newsom's felicitous phrase.
2. Second, though *DavComp* may well be sectarian, that does not necessitate that the whole of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* (or the "*11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter," if one assumes such a tradition) is sectarian. *DavComp* is, after all, unattested in any other manuscript, including those that supposedly support the "*11QPs<sup>a</sup>*-Psalter." The sectarian origin of one part of a compilation—like a psalter—does not prove the sectarian nature of the entire compilation, just as the non-sectarian nature of one part of a compilation does not prove the non-sectarian nature of the entire compilation. Such is the nature of a composite, complex document. (60) This hypothetical point granted, a sectarian provenience for *DavComp* does raise rather serious questions about *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* as a whole, if only because previous scholarship has attached much significance to *DavComp*'s import for the whole at precisely this point (see §2 above). Among other issues, these serious questions include how and why a larger non-sectarian manuscript (tradition) should or would contain sectarian compositions, and what we should do with (and/or call) such a hybrid composition if that is in fact what we have in *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*. (61) In

(58) C. D. Elledge has reminded me that a similar cooptation of an earlier hero for use in a later and different group may be found in 2 *Macc* 14:6, which makes Judas Maccabeus the leader of the Hasideans. Contrast 1 *Macc* 2:42; 7:12-17, where the Hasideans are a distinct group, separate from the Maccabees.

(59) E.g., Flint, "Psalms and Psalters," 250: "The absence of 'sectually explicit' Qumranic indicators in *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* (*11Q5*) suggest that none of the pieces was actually composed there." He defines such explicit terminology as "[f]or example, references to the Righteous Teacher" (ibid., 250 n. 56; similarly, *idem*, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 199), which is probably too restrictive.

(60) Cf. Sanders, "*Variorum*," 89.

(61) Perhaps the excerpted biblical texts or *Testimonia* provide something com-



short, while the use of דרך + תמים seems to lend support for seeing a sectarian provenience for *DavComp*, that provenience, in turn, may also lend support in favor of the doubters of the Qumran Psalms Hypothesis. The opposition party in the “Great *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* Debate” may be right about *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* after all.

And yet, even if the overall form and structure of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is deemed sectarian, (62) more needs to be said. An important part of that subsequent discussion would be to investigate what purpose the form of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* and the scroll itself may have played in the life of the

parable, showcasing sectarian form that includes or incorporates non-sectarian content. Flint has mentioned these texts with reference to the Psalms scrolls, though without developing the analogy very far (see, e.g., *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 217-18). For a fuller study, see Strawn “Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran,” 107-67. Also deserving consideration at this point is the work of Devorah Dimant, “Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002* (eds. E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 105-34, who argues for a tertiary category between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian.” She includes *Jubilees* and *11QT* as potential candidates for this category, and argues extensively that the *Apocryphon of Joshua* (4Q338-379; 5Q522; 5Q9) is exactly such a document. This intermediate category concerns works “that share a number of notions with the community, but which also evidence perhaps an even wider frame of thought.” (134). Note that Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007), has recently argued for a redaction of *Jubilees* from within an Essene sect or stream. Cf. also Roger S. Nam, “How to Rewrite Torah: The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the *Reworked Pentateuch* (4QRP),” *RevQ* 23 (2007): 153-66, who has argued against “any strict polarity between sectarian versus non-sectarian in favor of a broader continuum when classifying the scrolls” (154-55; cf. also 165). Together, these works might suggest that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is a kind of sectarian or proto-sectarian recension of the *Psalms*, in-between a “fully” scriptural version and a “fully” sectarian one. (My thanks to C. D. Elledge for bringing the works of Dimant, Segal, and Nam to my attention.)

(62) Certainly not solely on the basis of *DavComp*, but certainly including the evidence from *DavComp*. That is, Flint’s numerous (and frequently cogent) arguments about the structure and organization of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* may still stand; they at least need to be carefully addressed and thoroughly refuted if his entire thesis is to be rejected. Dahmen has attempted to do just that. Note, regardless, the earlier cautions of Wilson, “The Qumran Psalms Manuscripts”: “Since we cannot fully recover the intent of the editor, we cannot know certainly what relative authority he placed on conflicting and supporting arrangements” (385); and, later, when he writes that a decision in many of these matters is “impossible to determine absolutely,” though he ends up favoring the position of Sanders (388; cf. 386). See above for the multiple meanings of “sectarian” and for the fact that, in the case of a compilation, not all of the constituent components need be judged sectarian even if the complex as a whole is. Clearly not every piece of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is sectarian—at least not in a narrowly defined sense or in terms of sectarian *authorship* (reception and use, however, are probably very different stories).

Community (and this is so regardless of whether or not the manuscript is sectarian). In an ideal world, this investigation would press beyond the useful-but-admittedly-quite-vague category of "liturgical use." (63) Another crucial point to stress is that, even if the compilation as a whole is sectarian (in form and function), its pieces may still be of considerable text-critical worth. (64) Finally, even if *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is dubbed "sectarian," this need not be taken as implying anything against its status as an authoritative ("canonical") psalter at Qumran. (65) Indeed, it may actually *prove* such authoritative status—or, equally as important in my view—authoritative *function*. (66)

(63) For a discussion of what the designation "liturgical" means for various texts at Qumran, see the helpful article by Eileen M. Schuller, "Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts from Qumran," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 153–71, esp. 162–69.

(64) On both aspects—overall, sectarian form and constituent, text-critically useful parts—see Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran," 107–67; and *idem*, "Excerpted 'Non-Biblical' Scrolls at Qumran? Background, Analogies, Function," in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (eds. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 65–123. The excerpted biblical MSS evidence a functional, context-specific (i.e., sectarian use-related) form even though their constituent parts are not sectarian and do not evidence sectually explicit language. This nuances Dahmen's conclusions (e.g., *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 313) because even if *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* was compiled/composed at Qumran for particular purposes, parts, at least, of the scrolls might still be useful for text-critical (and redaction-historical) purposes, not just for the reception history of the Psalter.

(65) Cf. Sanders, "*Variorum*," 91: even if *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is "a 'vulgar' text, as Professor Kahle would say, it does *not* mean that it was ill-treated or thought of as 'unofficial' by those who used it" (his emphasis). Similarly, *idem*, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 14.

(66) For functional authority (canonicity/canonical status) at Qumran, see Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran"; *idem*, "Excerpted 'Non-Biblical' Scrolls"; and *idem*, "Authority: Textual, Traditional, or Functional? A Response to C. D. Elledge," in *Jewish and Christian Scriptures: The Function of 'Canonical' and 'Non-Canonical' Religious Texts* (eds. James H. Charlesworth and Lee Martin McDonald; JCTCRS 7; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2010), 104–12. The point is simply that one need not assume the preexistence of MT-150 to argue that *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* is a secondary collection in the sense of functionality. Even if it is a functional collection—indeed, precisely *because* it is functional—*11QPs<sup>a</sup>* may be considered authoritative literature at Qumran. In my judgment, Flint seems at times to confuse or conflate these categories though he is certainly not the first or only one to do so (cf. the similar critique in Skehan, "Qumran and Old Testament Criticism," 164). Again, note the important cautions of Wilson, "The Qumran Psalms Scroll Reconsidered," 639–40: "the presence of 'canonical' psalms in *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* does not necessarily extend authority to the apocryphal compositions ranged alongside them.... 'Authority' attributed to all the individual compositions of a collection does not necessitate the acceptance of the authority of the arrangement demonstrated in that collection. As a result, even if all the 'apocryphal' compositions of *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* could be shown to be 'authoritative,' one would still not be justified in declaring their arrangement (i.e., *11QPs<sup>a</sup>*) authoritative."

There can be little doubt that the “Great *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* Debate” will continue. But let it do so with as much data as possible: data as large as the overall form of the manuscript and as small as particular word usage and specific syntagms. After all, in that old adage that the Qumranites would certainly have agreed with, perfection (תמיים) is usually found in the details.

Brent A. STRAWN

## NOTES SUR LE MANUSCRIT ARAMÉEN 4Q201 = 4QHÉNOCH<sup>a</sup>. À PROPOS D'UN LIVRE RÉCENT

EN 1976, J.T. Milik présentait une savante édition préliminaire de fragments araméens des manuscrits de *1 Hénoch* qu'il avait identifiés et estimait avoir remis en place (1), réservant l'*editio princeps* de tous les fragments repérés dans le volume alors programmé des *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. En effet, la communauté scientifique l'attendait impatiemment depuis le jour de septembre 1952 où, participant à la fouille de la grotte 4, il dit avoir identifié *in situ* des fragments araméens de cet Apocryphe. Ayant fourni une abondante documentation et une hypothèse de composition du livre, il attendait les premières réactions des collègues qui, dans l'ensemble, furent très positives, même si des réserves ont été exprimées sur tel ou tel détail, en particulier sur la datation des *Paraboles* qui auraient remplacé le *Livre des Géants* d'un pentateuque hénochite. Mais des considérations étrangères à la science l'empêchèrent d'en fournir l'*editio princeps*, tant les jalousies l'emportèrent sur la déontologie.

En effet, au cours de la dernière décennie du vingtième siècle, E. Tov, le nouvel éditeur en chef désigné, redistribua la publication des manuscrits des lots de la grotte 4 attribués à Milik et à Strugnell. Il confia à d'autres la publication des derniers fragments identifiés par Milik mais non replacés dans la composition. Ainsi parurent de brèves notes en *DJD XXXVI*, et l'ensemble des fragments du *Livre Astronomique* et du *Livre des Géants* de son lot, l'éditeur en chef ne considérant plus nécessaire l'*editio princeps* de cet ensemble de fragments. On peut regretter cette décision d'un *opus imperfectum* sur *1 Hénoch* araméen.

(1) J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford, 1976).

Depuis lors, l'auteur d'une thèse de doctorat a estimé qu'une « nouvelle *editio princeps* était indispensable » (2). L'étude des fragments commence par présenter à l'échelle 1/1 les différentes reproductions connues de l'auteur (mais le papier utilisé ne rend pas la clarté du papier glacé des planches d'une publication digne de ce nom), ainsi que les agrandissements qui livrent le plus souvent des tracés flous. De son côté l'étude paléographique apporte rarement du nouveau, comme le démontre la multiplication des propositions de lecture. Ces lignes voudraient apporter un certain nombre de corrections nécessaires dans le déchiffrement des fragments araméens de 4Q201.

### Les fragments 1a-b

L'auteur ne note pas la forme de *mem* final pour le médial au fragment 1a 2. Le seul point discutable était la lecture douteuse de 'm[ll, sans trace de hampe de *lamed*, à lire 'mr[ (3), mais la proposition ]gb~~r~~w[ en 1a 6 (p. 73) n'a pas de fondement, *gbrw* étant assuré avec Milik. En revanche, la proposition br]k en 1a 1, est impossible dans cette graphie, on attendrait des traces de la tête du *kaf* final avant celle de sa base, ainsi que le notait déjà l'éditeur (p. 143) ; on suivra là encore la lecture du *nun* par Milik comme bien préférable et nécessaire pour un alignement normal à la marge. Comme l'identification de l'éditeur avec le début du livre ne fait aucune difficulté, on ne comprend pas l'entêtement à vouloir chercher autre chose et proposer des solutions aux difficultés cumulées. En définitive, les résultats pour le fragment 1a se réduisent à la correction de la ligne 4 et aux infimes traces de *nun* et de *šin*, ligne 3, qui 'confirment' la restauration de l'éditeur. La proposition m[wtbh au lieu de m[dwrh, l. 5, est peut-être préférable sans plus, tout comme, l. 6, *hsn*] *gbrw*[th grâce au parallèle de 4Q531 22 3, publié après l'étude de Milik. Enfin, l. 7, lire k]l q~~s~~w[y (2 fois), comme je l'ai déjà proposé en déchiffrant la même expression en 4Q541 9 1.

(2) Michaël Langlois, *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d'Hénoch. Étude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrân* (Lectio Divina hors série, Le Cerf, Paris 2008) (*sic* p. 9). Voir ma recension à paraître en *RB*, pour un certain nombre de remarques sur d'autres points et insuffisances qui ne sont pas repris dans cette note. L'auteur a repris la plupart de ses lectures dans les notes de sa contribution à *La bibliothèque de Qumrân. I Torah Genèse* (Le Cerf - Paris 2008), 16-27.

(3) Lecture déjà corrigée dans mon exemplaire, mais que reprend *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Volume One 1Q1-4Q273, ed. F. García Martínez & E. Tigchelaar (Leiden-New York-Köln 1997), 398 (ce volume donne une traduction suivie sans correspondance en araméen). On ne comprend pas les [ ] de m[ ]r, l. 4, p. 72s.

Les difficultés de lecture de **1b** se trouvent aux lignes 4, 5 et 6. Pour la l. 5, *qšwy*, voir la 7, et *he* ensuite sans axe brisé pour *alef* (cuir déchiré) avec Milik malgré l'auteur. Mais au début de la l. 4, l'angle des tracés ne convient qu'à *taw* avec l'auteur. La ligne 3 de 1b comprenait un *vacat* de 2 cm en début de ligne avec Milik, ce que l'a. ne note pas avec ses points de suspension. Et la restauration de la ligne montre qu'on doit lire *ld]n* au lieu de *lh]dn* de l'édition (4). La lecture de lb 1 et des autres lignes est confirmée par la restauration du passage avec la 3, ce que ne fait pas l'a. en ne situant jamais les deux fragments côte à côte (5). Et les restes après *mem* suggèrent fortement de lire *lamed-yod*. Lire donc *mly[ 'yry]n*. La lecture de la l. 4 exclut la restauration *r]bh* de Milik, et favorise une lecture *mn mšry]th* de l'a. (mais sans assimilation du *nun*, ce qui ne correspond pas à la langue de cette époque d'une part et qui est nécessaire pour l'alignement à la marge d'autre part) correspondant au grec et connu de 4Q556 1 3, 4Q558 40 2, 1QApGn XXXI 1. Si la lecture *qšw]y* que j'avais déjà proposée, s'impose à l'évidence, il n'est pas certain qu'il faille suivre l'a. dans la restauration *wyzw[ 'n* ensuite, avec un sujet féminin : comme la lacune avec *k]l* en la 7 laisserait apparaître un espace beaucoup trop grand, on se demande s'il ne faut pas lire au moins *wyzw[ 'wn k]l* au pluriel masculin pour l'espace (voir la forme masculine de *qšwy*). À la l. 6, il faut rapprocher les bords de la cassure, et entre la tête de *waw* et le départ d'une haste qui suit un *waw/yod*, il n'y a pas de place pour une autre lettre, certainement pas *taw-reš* malgré la simulation, à moins de lire *qof*. Pour l'espace à la marge de droite, on devrait lire avec la partie conservée : *dy 'r'' wyz]w'wn wy[šplwn*. Le fragment 1b est rétréci comparé à 1a, et il faut envisager la marge à deux cm à droite de 1b ; cela a aussi son importance pour la compréhension et la lecture de la l. 1, appuyant assurément la lecture de l'éditeur.

Lire ainsi **1a + 1b** 1-8 (sans donner ici une restauration complète de la partie gauche de la colonne) (6) = *I Hénoch* 1,1-6 :

(4) Voir aussi M.A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A new edition in the light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, Vol. 2 *Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford, 1978), 58. Langlois ne peut pas décider (p. 97) faute de mise en colonne.

(5) On comprend mal la prétention « Nous proposons donc de restaurer ici ... », p. 98, et très souvent ailleurs, alors que l'a. reprend exactement la proposition de l'éditeur, tout en feignant de l'ignorer.

(6) Voir Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 141 s. Milik, estime à environ 20 cm la largeur de cette première colonne qui ne commençait pas en haut de la feuille contrairement à l'habitude, sans doute par manque de colonne de garde (p. 139). Noter aussi que ce manuscrit a été réutilisé et qu'il porte au verso un autre texte, une liste généalogique des Patriarches, *hwlyd* (p. 139), qui n'a pas encore été publiée, pas même dans

- 1 מלי ברכתה די ברכ בה[ן חנ<ו>ך לבח[ירין קשיטין...
- 2 וקשיטין יפלטון וגסב[מתלוה[י א]מר[ן חנוך ... חזו מן אלהא...
- 3 אתחזית לי[ ומן מלין עירי[ן וקדישין כלה ש[מעט אנה ... ואתבגנת
- 4 אנה לא לד[ן דרה להן לד[ר ר]חיק אנה אמר[ן ...
- 5 [ vacat ינפק קדיש[ה ר]בה מן מ[ותבה]...
- 6 מן משרי[תה ויופע ב[חסן גברו[תה מן שמי שמיה...
- 7 בכל קצו[י ארעה ויוז[ען כ]ל קצו[י ארעא...
- 8 די ארעא ויו[ען וי[שפלון וישתרון טורין רמין...

1,1 <sup>1</sup>Les paroles de bénédiction par les]quelles Hénoch [bénit] les é[lu]s justes...<sup>2</sup>et les justes seront délivrés. 1,2 Et Hénoch ]pro]féra s]es poèmes,[...une vision (venant) de Dieu ...<sup>3</sup>me fut montrée] et des paroles[ des veilleu]rs et des saints[ j'ai ]tout en[tendu[...]]'ai <sup>4</sup>[compris], ce n'est pas pour cet]te génération mais pour une génér[ation lo]intaine que je parl[e. 1,3... <sup>5</sup>vacat [Le] Saint[, le Gr]and sortira de [Sa] de[meure, 1,4... <sup>6</sup>de] Son [cam]p et Il apparaîtra dans[ la force de Sa ]puissan[ce depuis les cieux des cieux. 1,5...<sup>7</sup>par toutes les extrémi]tés de la terre, et [tou]tes les extrémi]tés de la terre vaci]lleront,[...<sup>8</sup>de la terre 1,6 et les hautes montagnes] vaci]lleront et elles t[omberont et seront dissoutes...

### Les fragments 1c i + d

En 1c i 1, on suit Milik pour les traces de ]n wl' m'b[ryn à compléter par b]hlkn « leur parcours » partiellement avec l'auteur, au lieu de l'étrange wlmmsr[th]n l' hlkn, beaucoup trop long pour l'espace et incorrect en araméen qumranien. Pour la suite, suivre Milik à deux reprises, non l'a.

La fin de la ligne 2 est plus assurée : lire dl['] mštn' wklh mth[z]'[ l]kn ]hzw...en partie avec Milik et en partie avec l'a. Auparavant, la lecture est plus difficile, mais on lit au mieux mn r]'šnh (7) lswp[h, ce qui diverge quelque peu de la proposition de l'a. malgré les simulations trompeuses, et sans l'assimilation du nun de mn.

À la ligne 3, lire vraisemblablement mth]lk 'bdh klh 'lyh wbdgly šwt' d[y ]k[l] 'r'' avec de légères traces de bet à la première cassure, le kaf et le pied du lamed noircis et des traces de kaf enfin, passage non lu par Milik ni par l'a., malgré quelques suggestions. En outre, le sens de dgly « étendard, insigne » doit désigner les signes indicateurs des saisons, non les « cohortes ».

À la l. 4, on accepte le placement de 1d par Milik avec des traces de 'aīn, pour ]'nnh[ à lire au mieux d'après les traces et l'écriture

l'édition de *DJD XXXVI* (voir *infra*) et cela paraît avoir échappé à l'a. qui ne mentionne pas (p. 62) cette importante remarque de Milik.

(7) Avec une lecture šin, il faut alors voir des restes du jambage de alef.



supralinéaire (?) : *w*]'*n**nh*[ *w*]'[*lh* ]<*w**m*[*tr*]*h*> '*lyh* (8) *špkyn* *ḥzw dkl* '*yl*[*nyh* ]*klhn* *kybyšyn* (une lecture ]*glyn* est impossible par le coude anguleux de la lettre, et *mlyh* est loin de s'imposer, l. 3) (9).

Lire des traces de *nun* final en '*ylnyn*, l. 5 (10).

Une lecture ]*d*, l. 6, est plus que difficile sans trace de la tête du *dalet* et pour l'espace, on propose de lire des traces bien plus vraisemblables du crochet de *yod* (voir le suivant). À gauche du trou est le tracé du *nun* suivi d'un grand *yod*, non le jambage gauche de *šin*, puis traces de lettres (en usant du contraste), les plus assurées sont *hwh* et *nun* final (lecture *ad sensum* bien préférable à celle de Milik pour les traces, mais l'a. ne lit rien).

À la l. 7, lire ]*llyn* *wmstry**n* assurés par les restes au lieu de ]*ll* de l'édition et malgré la simulation pour *mṭln*, ]*et*, deux *lamed* et *yod-nun*. Par les restes la lecture *w'l* '*bnyh* de l'a., l. 8, est bien meilleure que *kpyh* de l'éditeur, trop court par ailleurs.

À la l. 9, la lecture *wḥzw dkl* '*lyhn* est tout à fait acceptable, appuyée par 4Q*Hen*<sup>c</sup>, au lieu de *ytnys*[*wn*] de Milik.

À la l. 10, *w'tbwnwn* semble précédé du verbe [*w*(?)]*dršw* pour les traces (PAM 42.227) et l'espace.

À la l. 11, on devrait vraisemblablement lire ]*hw*' avec Milik, tracé de *he* aussi bien que de *ḥet*. Et ensuite 4Q*Hen*<sup>c</sup> a une leçon quelque peu différente.

À la l. 12, reste de la base de *kaf* de ]*klhn* avec Milik préférable à *nun* final de l'a. (le joint demande une correction de placement).

À la l. 13, la lecture de l'a. *wt*]{*b*}<*m*>*rwn* s'impose mais comme correction de *bet* en *mem*.

À la l. 14, lire ]*n* *lt*... avec apparemment (?) de très légères traces du pied de *taw*.

À la l. 15, lire *bl*[*w*]' ]*lm*[(*yn*(?) *wrḥ*]*myn*. Il n'y a pas de traces de *lamed* pour lire '*lm* *w*[*lt* *rḥ*]*myn*, ni de restes de *waw* mais une tête du *mem* final ou médial. Les cassures demandent de rapprocher les bords et il n'y aurait pas d'espace suffisant pour cette lecture, et tout juste pour le pluriel (Milik). La restauration en début de ligne est insuffisante pour l'espace, faudrait-il envisager une correction du verbe *yṭ'bdn* « seront en perdition » avec le grec en *yṭpsqn* « seront interrompues » (avec l'éthiopien), ou inversement, ou?

(8) La lecture n'est pas assurée mais paraît rendre au mieux les traces visibles et aurait l'appui de l'éthiopien. Noter les plis de la languette de cuir à déployer pour un espace correct, contrairement aux simulations fautives de l'a.

(9) La simulation est trompeuse encore une fois, et le *mem* serait dans une lacune, alors que les bords de la cassure joignent !

(10) Dans la restauration, on a inversé les mots de la proposition de Milik à cause du placement du fragment 1d et de l'absence de traces de *lamed* attendu.

Le fragment **1d** est déjà photographié sur PAM 42.446.

Texte et traduction de **1c i + 1d 1-17** (4QHen<sup>c</sup> 1 i souligné) pour une largeur de colonne de 13,5 cm environ (11) = 1 Hénoch 2,1 à 5,6 :

*Marge supérieure*

- 1 ובמעדיהן מתחזין ולא מעברין [בהלכן חזו] לארעה ואתבוננו בעבד<ה>
- 2 [דמתעבד מן רא] שנה לסופה דלא משתנא וכלה מתחזין א לכן חזו לדגלי
- 3 [קיסא די מתה] לך עבדה כלה עליה ובדגלי שתוא ד[כ]ל [ארעא
- 4 [תתמלא מן] ונענה ט[לה] וימט[ר] ה> עליה שפכין חזו דכל איל[ניה] כלהן כבישין
- 5 [ומנפילין עליהן כלהן ברא] מן ארבעת עסר אילנין דעליהן מתקיימין<
- 6 [ולא מחדתין עליהן עד ד] תרתין ותלת שנין הוה עברין חזו לכן לדגלי
- 7 [קיסה דשמש בהן כו]ה ושלקה ואנתן טללין ומסתרין בעין מן קדמיה
- 8 [על אנפי ארעה כו]ה ולמ[דר]ך על עפרה ועל אבניה לא תשכחון מן
- 9 [חמתה חזו ודעו בכל א]ילניה כלהן וחזו [ד]כל עליהן בהן ירוקין וחפין
- 10 [אילניה וכל פריהן לה] דר תשבחה [ו]ררשו ואתבוננו בכל עבדיה אלן
- 11 [ואשכילו דאלהה די חי] הוא לעלם דעלמין עבד כל עבדיה אלן שנה
- 12 [בשנה לא ישון עבדה ו]כלהן עבדין ממרה ואנתן שניתן עבדן
- 13 [ולא תעבדון ממרה ות] [ב] <מ>רון עלוהי רברבן וקשין ביום טמתכן
- 14 [על רבותה קשי לבב אנת] לן לת שלם לכן אדין יומיכן תלוט[ו]ן ו[שני]
- 15 [חייכן יתאבדן] יתפסקן (?) ושני אבדנכן יסגין בלוט[ו]ן ע[לם] / ק (?) ורח[מין]
- 16 [ושלם לת לכן אדין להון שמהתכ] לן ללוט עלם ל[כל] קשיטין ובכן ילוטון
- 17 [כל מתליטין וכל חטאין ורשיעין בכין ימון] ולכל[כן] חטאין לת פרקן

<sup>1</sup>et dans leurs saisons, elles apparaissent]t et ne s'écarte[nt] pas dans leur parcours. 2,2 Vo[yez] la terre et considérez ses travaux <sup>2</sup>[qui sont faits du commen]cement jusqu'à la fin, qu'ils ne changent pas, mais tout est visib[il]e pour vous. 2,3 Voyez les signes de <sup>3</sup>[l']été où se dé[r]oulent tous les travaux à sa surface, et les signes de l'hiver quand toute la terre <sup>4</sup>[est remplie d'eau, et de ]nuée, de rosée <et de plu]e> se déversant toutes sur elle. 3,1 Voyez que tous [les] arbr[es] sont tous comme desséchés <sup>5</sup>[et tous dépouillés de leur feuillage, à l'exception ]des quatorze arbres dont le feuillage persiste, <sup>6</sup>[et ils ne renouvellent pas leur feuillage avant q]u'[aient] passé deux ou trois années. 4,1 [Voyez] aussi les signes de <sup>7</sup>[l']été où le soleil y est arde]nt et brûlant et vous-mêmes, vous cherchez des ombres et des abris contre lui <sup>8</sup>[sur la terre brûlante. Et fo]uler la poussière et les pierres, vous ne pouvez pas à cause de <sup>9</sup>[sa chaleur. 5,1 Voyez et connaissez tous] les arbres, eux tous, et voyez [que tous] leurs feuillages sont verdoyants et recouvrent <sup>10</sup>[les arbres, et tous leurs fruits sont une pa]rure de gloire. Examinez et considérez toutes ces œuvres, <sup>11</sup>[et reconnaissez que] c'est [le Dieu vivant] pour les siècles des

(11) *Idem* Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 139. La restauration du début des lignes suit en gros celle de Milik ; elle a pour but de donner la distance à la marge et la quantité de texte à y lire pour un texte suivi en s'appuyant sur 4QHen<sup>c</sup> quand le parallèle est conservé.

siècles (12) qui a fait toutes ces œuvres. **5,2** Année <sup>12</sup>[par année leurs œuvres ne changent pas, mais] toutes accomplissent Son ordre (13). **5,4** Mais vous, vous avez changé votre œuvre, <sup>13</sup>[et vous n'exécutez pas Son ordre, mais vous dites à Son encontre des énormités et des insolences, le jour de votre impureté, <sup>14</sup>[contre Sa majesté. Vous êtes, vous], [des cœurs endurcis], il n'y aura pas de paix pour vous. **5,5** Alors vous maudirez vos jours et les années de <sup>15</sup>[votre vie {seront en perdition} <seront interrompues>(?) et les années de votre perdition se multiplieront dans une malédiction éternelle, [et de misère] corde <sup>16</sup>[et de paix il n'y aura pas pour vous. **5,6** Alors vous [noms seront] en malédiction éternelle pour [tous les justes, et, par vous, maudiront <sup>17</sup>tous ceux qui maudissent, et tous les pécheurs et les impies, par vous, jureront,] et pour [vous] tous, [pécheurs, il n'y aura pas de salut.

### Les fragments 1c ii + e (+ r + s + q) + 4 + 5

En **1c ii** 10, la lecture *tltt* avec Milik est certaine.

À la l. 11, le ductus autorise autant, sinon mieux, la lecture *šhry'l* avec Milik que *šhry'l* avec l'a., le *he* non final a rarement une très large tête et la haste gauche ne dépasse pas le plus souvent le trait de la tête, d'autant que le dieu lune est bien connu dans la culture araméenne (Stèles d'Afis, de Nérab et de Turquie par exemple) ; mais *het* n'est pas totalement exclu (voir *4QHen'*).

À la l. 13, l'a. retient avec raison la lecture des correction et addition supralinéaire de Black (14) *rbny<n><wrb[n]>* (avec le fragment 1r de l'a.), au lieu des signes d'insertion de part et d'autre de la ligne lus par l'éditeur.

À la l. 17, le tracé demande de lire *alef*, au lieu du *he* de Milik pour l'état emphatique.

À la l. 18, au contraire, on pourrait hésiter entre *'nšh* avec l'a. et *'nš'* avec Milik comme à la l. 19, au sens collectif ici, mais les tracés sont identiques à celui de *wl'* qui suit ; on retiendra la lecture *alef* à cause de l'axe de la lettre et non du trait horizontal de la tête (comparer lignes 15-16 et 19). Au début de cette ligne, lire simplement *wšryw* avec Sokoloff (15) au lieu de *qšryn* de l'éditeur.

(12) M. Sokoloff, « Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4 », *Maarav*, 1/2 (1978-79) 197-224, p. 205, comprend : « ... who lives for ever, who has since time immemorial done all these deeds », contrairement au grec.

(13) La copie semble avoir oublié le verset 5,3 par haplographie de *mmrh* en fin de 5,2 à *mmrh* en fin de 5,3.

(14) M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes in Consultation with James C. VanderKam* (SVTP 7; Leiden, 1985), 123.

(15) Voir déjà M. Sokoloff, « Notes on the Aramaic Fragments », *cit.*, p. 199.

À la l. 20, la lecture est difficile, mais il est clair que *qwbl kl knp* *w[h̄yw]t* de l'éditeur n'est pas recevable, alors que *]ʿbl kl* paraît clair, à l'exclusion de *h̄bl* envisagé par l'a., suivi au mieux de *b̄sr* ♂, l'alignement exigeant sans doute un *waw* en début de ligne, la cassure a disloqué *śin* paraissant *zāin-ʿaīn* et *reš*, voir PAM 43.197 (difficilement *pe* final à la crosse partiellement endommagée sur PAM 42.227) (16). À la première cassure de gauche, jambage légèrement convexe à droite, et à la suivante, tête de lettre assez indistincte : *samēk/taw/reš*, puis *ʿaīn*. L'espace et les restes favorisent une lecture *w]ʿbl kl b̄sr* ♂[..*]rʿ[*], proche du sens du grec et de l'éthiopien. Mais une lecture *[w]ʿbl kl bzh d* ♂[ *]q/r/tʿ* « [et] *amēna* tout butin que [(?)... » de l'a. n'est pas recevable d'une part et, d'autre part, on attendrait la graphie *wʿwbl*.

À la l. 21, lire *mem/ʿaīn-yod/waw-bet* et plus loin une tête (triangulaire ?) de lettre *waw/yod*, puis un départ de jambage *nun/pe* final/♂. Au-dessus de la ligne, lire *wtnyn* « et des serpents/monstres » préférable à *tnnyn*, et *wnny* de Milik est difficile. On lirait ainsi le début de la ligne 21: *pš]ʿw b[nn]yn <wtnyn>*[... « Ils péch]èrent contre les [poisson]s <et les serpents/reptiles>[... », ou mieux encore *b[ʿ]wp* « contre les[ois]eaux <et les monstres[]> », lecture préférable, puisqu'elle s'accorde avec les traces et avec les versions grecques et éthiopienne. De plus cette lecture rejoint assez bien la traduction grecque qui ne répète pas, à la suite de l'araméen et à l'opposé de l'éthiopien, la préposition « contre », en supposant que l'ordre des substantifs est identique : « et ils se mirent à pêcher contre les oiseaux et les [b]êtes et reptiles et les [p]oissons... » (17).

Le fragment 1q (pour reprendre la numérotation de l'a.) avait été rapproché par l'éditeur de 1c ii 20 à 23, principalement à cause de la correction supra-linéaire de 1c ii 21, mais apparemment sans joint direct. Pour sa part, l'a. préférerait un joint à droite aux lignes 20-21 (18). En fait, le joint existe mais avec la partie gauche de 1q, jambage de *reš* et tête de la lettre en 1c ii 20 (bords coupés en biseau et se superposant). La l. 1 de 1q est de lecture assurée avec 1c ii 20 et le

(16) Mais la lecture *w]ʿbl kl bzh d* « et] *amēna* tout butin que » de l'a. surprend à plusieurs titres, autant que *qwbl kl knp w*[ qu'il prétend corriger.

(17) Voir *Apocalypsis Henochi graece*, edidit M. Black, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum judaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis*, collegit et ordinavit A.-M. Denis, (Leiden, 1970), 22.

(18) Voir l'affirmation de l'a. (p. 358s) qui y verrait même un joint direct avec la partie droite du fragment 1q. Mais après bien des suppositions sans fondements, l'a. finit par reconnaître l'incertitude, p. 363. C'est dire que ses lectures et ses explications sont inutiles pour ces lignes malgré les simulations pour forcer les lectures, une lecture *lmʿkl* est impossible.

jambage de *het* : *kl bśr ḥ[yw]t 'r'['*. La l. 2a ] *ymh*[ est à lire avec 1c ii 21a *wtnyn w[nny] ymh*], *wyny* étant possible par l'espace avant la hampe du *lamed* de 1c ii 21 (légère trace de *waw* à la cassure). À la l. 2 de 1q, ]-*kl bśr*[ doit comprendre soit un *waw* (crochet de la tête) ou des restes de l'oblique du *mem* médial, mais la proximité de la hampe de *lamed* en bord de cassure en 1c ii 21 (trace de départ à gauche de la hampe du *nun* final de 21a) fait préférer la lecture du *mem* : ]*lmkl bśr*[ en orthographe défective, contrairement à l'a. qui ne lit pas le *alef* (p. 354s) mais le transcrit (p. 363s), suite au positionnement retenu qui est impossible. En outre, le joint des fragments exclut un *waw* avant le *lamed* de l'infinitif « et à ]dévorer la chair[ » de l'a., lire plus simplement un gérondif *lmkl bśr* « en dévorant la chair[ ». Cette séquence montre que l'araméen n'a pas distingué « les bêtes et les reptiles », présents dans le grec et l'éthiopien. Mais *θηρίον* désigne « la bête sauvage, mauvaise, le monstre », traduisant alors parfaitement *tnyn* araméen, non distingué des reptiles du grec et de l'éthiopien, à moins qu'une deuxième correction n'ait ajouté « et les reptiles » *wrhšyn* après *ymh*, voir 4QHen<sup>b</sup> 1 i 24 d'après Milik, mais la copie peut, elle aussi, être fautive. Lire ainsi l. 3 (= 1c ii 22) : ]*l mh*[ (lecture différente de l'édition préliminaire, mais l'a. ne lit rien), et l. 4 (= 1c ii 23) : ]*l* avec Milik. (Le joint de ce fragment avec 1c ii supprime la nomenclature 1q).

La lecture du fragment **1e** ne fait pas grande difficulté dans l'ensemble.

À la l. 1, la restauration du passage demande de lire la trace comme le bas de la hampe de *qof* de *w]q[rw* au lieu de *nun* de Milik.

À la l. 2, lire très probablement *alef*, préférable à *he*, et la restauration de 1c ii 5 + 1e 2 permettrait de lire ... *bh (b)zmn*]', l'espace et la langue du manuscrit n'autorisant pas de restaurer *bh zmn' dn*]. Cette expression pourrait être suggérée par le grec *ἐν ἀνθρώποις...*, comparer *Dn* 3,7, parallèle à *Dn* 3,6.15 ; 4,30; 5,5 *bh š't'*, 4Q541 10 3, 4Q210 1 ii 18, 4Q550 1 3, ou 4Q552 1 i + 2 7 lisant plus simplement *bšt'*, mais on attendrait alors un féminin en grec *ἐν ἀνθρώποις...* (19) On pourrait aussi lire *bh bmlt*]' « en cette affaire/ en cela », ou *bh bmwm*]' « par ce serment » qui sont féminin en araméen, ou plus simplement encore *bh bmlk*]' « dans ce projet/dessin », voir le mot

(19) Une lecture *bh* « upon/on it », est difficile en elle-même pour combler l'espace, voir le texte grec corrompu, G. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 2001), 175. Il faut supposer une formule plus longue, soit *bh bṭwr*]', soit *bh bzmn*]', le premier *bh* pouvant reprendre le toponyme. Mais le démonstratif *dn*]' est exclu dans cette main pour lire *bṭwr' dn*]', ce manuscrit ne connaissant que la forme *dn*.

déjà à la ligne 2 (20). Ce dernier mot est séparé par un court *vacat*, mais la restauration de la ligne ne permet pas de lire un *vacat* en fin de ligne avec l'éditeur.

À la l. 3, il faut corriger le nom du troisième ange : *rmš*['l, au lieu de *rmṭ*['l de l'éditeur, *šin* (21) préférable à *tet*.

À la l. 4, lire *r'm*['l, avec Milik, il ne serait pas rare qu'une lettre finale occupe la place d'une médiale, mais le tracé est ici médial (comparer *mṭr*'l, l. 6), comme si le scribe s'apprêtait à écrire *r'my*['l avant de se raviser pour une forme de cas construit !

À la l. 5, il n'y a pas de trace de *nun* supposé par l'éditeur.

À la l. 6 il n'est pas nécessaire de restaurer *ḥd'sry*['l ni *try'sr*['y'.

À la l. 7, au lieu d'exponctuer, le scribe a écrit dans l'interligne le 'aïn au-dessus du *alef* fautif : {'}<'>*sr*, et restes de fines traces de *alef* à la cassure avec l'a.

La ligne 8 doit être lue, à la suite de l'éditeur, en tenant compte du joint direct sur un cm (du *yod* au pied du *lamed*) avec un fragment que l'a. a indûment séparé en lui donnant le sigle 4Q201 1s (p. 377-84, contrairement à ce qu'écrit l'a., p. 377). La surface est plissée au niveau du jambage droit du *alef* et le fragment est assez bien positionné sur la photographie PAM 43.197 (à décaler très légèrement à droite). Ce dernier fragment est lui-même composé de deux morceaux au joint direct malgré la déformation du cuir qui fait chevaucher le pied du *mem* sur la gauche en réduisant sa largeur (les simulations, p. 381s, ne tiennent pas compte des joints ni des distorsions et du fort rétrécissement de la partie droite de '1s'). La languette de cuir au-dessus du *taw* se place sous l'*alef* de la ligne 7 de 1e avec des traces de l'épaule du *taw* en 1e 8. La présence de l'ange Tûmiel est assurée, mais orthographié avec le *waw* (traces de la tête et de la base) : *twmy*'l, avec la même orthographe qu'en 4QHen<sup>b</sup> 1 ii 16 où on doit certainement lire *t]wmy*'l (22).

À la l. 9, le copiste a oublié d'écrire ou de corriger la dizaine <'sr> comme l'a signalé Milik. À la l. 10 de cet ensemble, la lecture *ḥ]bryhn*['l de l'a. (p. 384) s'impose malgré la déformation du cuir sur *r]bnyh*['n de l'éditeur.

(20) Le « serment » *mwmth* est masculin en grec ὄρκος, et le « dessein, projet » *mlkh* est féminin en grec γνόμεν qui devrait être repris par ἐν αὐτῷ, voir *botu* en éthiopien.

(21) Lecture déjà corrigée par ses devanciers, voir e. g. Knibb, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

(22) Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 150, Nickelsburg, *op. cit.*, p. 175, en restent à *tmy*'l, mais en 4QHen<sup>b</sup> 1 ii 16, le crochet du *waw* est encore préservé qu'on ne peut confondre avec le départ du jambage de *taw*, comparer le grec Θωνηλ. Ainsi les noms des vingt décurions sont maintenant connus en araméen, la seule hésitation réside entre *yhdy*'l et *whdy*'l (lecture préférable en 4QHen<sup>b</sup> 1 i 17) mais le doute n'est guère possible entre *šhry*'l/šḥry' l (voir *supra*).

On ne comprend pas pourquoi l'a. n'a pas étudié le fragment **1r** (p. 365-76) avec cet ensemble déjà bien identifié par Milik, même sans joint direct, d'autant qu'il retient cette même identification, sans innovation en 1c ii 10-13 !

À la l. 1 de 1r = 1c ii 10, la lecture ]'l 'r[ ]b't est assurée par l'identification et l'emplacement du fragment, il en est de même pour la l. 2 = 1c ii 11.

À la l. 3 = 1c ii 12, on doit certainement lire avec Milik ]lh ymy['l, et non ]lh ym'['l de l'a., le *yod* vient rejoindre le trait oblique de *mem*, voir le grec *Ιουμμηλ* ou *Ιουμειηλ* et l'éthiopien *Iomya'el* qui n'a rien à voir avec l'ugaritique *ym*. La dernière ligne ne fait pas de difficulté : ]thn 'n[, partiellement avec l'a. pour ]thn et avec Milik pour 'n[, (*lamed* est exclu comparé à *nun*), à compléter avec 1c ii 13 et 1s 3, afin que l'ensemble des fragments mis bout à bout fasse sens, ce que l'a. se refuse de faire. Toutefois cela est indispensable pour les lignes de ce passage assez bien conservées, d'autant que les traductions le permettent. Les fragments n'ont pas vocation à rester isolés mais à offrir si possible un texte lisible.

Sur le fragment **5** (p. 407s), qu'on lit au mieux ]m/w h[, un *dalet* est exclu par le tracé à la cassure de la l. 1, mais *mem* final ou *waw* souvent très allongé (voir *e. g.* 1 c ii 14 légèrement à gauche) sont possibles, puis jambage gauche de *hé* possible, et à la l. 2, lire ]bd[ sans espace. Ce fragment paraît devoir être situé à gauche de 1 c ii 21-22, avec une lecture identique à celle de 4Q202 = 4QHen<sup>b</sup> 1 ii 25a et 25.

Enfin, compte tenu de l'espace avant l'*alef* à la l. 1 et du *vacat* à la l. 2, on proposerait de placer le fragment **4** aux ll. 21-22 de 1 c ii.

La vérification de la restauration proposée par l'éditeur permet encore de récupérer le nom du cinquième décurion, vérifiable pour l'espace, en 1 ii 7, Tamiel avec le grec et l'éthiopien.

Lire donc ainsi le passage **1c ii + 1e** (+ 1r + 1s + 1q) + **4 + 5** 1-23 (les restes de 4QHen<sup>c</sup> sont soulignés, mais ceux de 4QHen<sup>b</sup> ne sont pas indiqués) pour une largeur de colonne estimée à *ca* 12,5 cm (23) = 1 Hénoch 6,4 à 8,1 :

#### Marge supérieure

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| ואמרו לה כלהן נמ[א מומא כלנה ונחרם כלנה חד לחד די לוי] | 1 |
| נתוב כלנה מן מלכה ד[ן עד די עבד עבדה דן vac אדין ימו]  | 2 |

(23) *Idem* Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 139. En revanche la restauration des lignes 17-18 par l'éditeur fait quelque difficulté pour leur longueur qui demanderait au moins 13 cm, et les restes préservés en dehors des parallèles conservés en 4QHen<sup>b</sup>. Cependant, la l. 17 paraît avoir conservé un texte dont on retrouve des traces dans le grec du Syncelle, voir Milik, *The Books of Enoch, op. cit.*, p. 157.



- 3 כלהן כחדה ואחרמ[ן] חד לחד והוו כלהן מאתין די נחתו]  
 4 ביומי ירד על [ראש חרמון טורה ו]ק[רו לטורה חרמון בדיל]  
 5 די ימו ואחרמ[ן] חד לחד בה במלכ] א vac ואלק[ן] שמתת רבניהן]  
 6 שמיחזה ד[י] הוה ראשהן ארעתק[ן] תנין לה רמש[אל תילת]  
 7 לה כוכבא[ל] רביעי לה תמיאל חמ[ישי לה רעמא]ל שתיתי לה]  
 8 דניאל שבי[עי לה זיקאל תמינ]י לה ברקאל תשיע[י לה]  
 9 עסאל עסירי [לה חרמני חדעסר]א לה מטראל תרעס[ר לה]  
 10 עננאל תלת עסר [לה שתון]אל ארבעת {א}<עסר לה שמיא[ל חמשת]  
 11 עסר לה שהריאל [ש]תת עסר לה תומיאל שבעת [עסר לה]  
 12 טוריאל תמנית עס[ר] לה ימי[א]ל תשעת <עסר> לה [והדיאל עסרין לה]  
 13 אילן אנון רבני<[ורב]נ[עס]ר[תהן]אנ[ן] וח[בריהן] כלהן נסבו להן]  
 14 נשין מן כל די בחרו ו[שריו למנעל עליהן ולאסתאבה בהן]  
 15 ולאפה אנן חרשה ו[אשפולה ומקטע שרשין ולאחיה להן עסבין]  
 16 והויה בטנן מנהן ויל[דה גברין כתלתת אלפין אמה די]  
 17 הוו מתילדין על ארעא [כילדותהן ומתרבין כרביותהן ודי הוו אכלין]  
 18 עמל כל בני אנשא ולא י[כילו אנשא לאספקה להן ותובו גבריא בהן]  
 19 ושריו לקטלה אנשא ו[למכל אנון ... ואתיו חרבן \ מות]  
 20 ו[אבל כל בשר ח]י[ת ארע]א ושריו ל ... וכלהן  
 21a ותננין ו[נני] ימה]  
 21 פש[עו ב]ע[וף למכל בשר]ביניהן [וה]ו[ו שתין דמה]א[דין קבלת ארעא  
 22 על רשיעיא על כ]ל מה[ן הוה מתע]בד[ vacat  
 23 עסאל אלף לאנשא [ל]מעבד חרבן די פרול ושכינן די נחש ו ...

6,4 <sup>1</sup>Et ils lui dirent tous : « Prêton[s tous serment en nous vouant tous à l'anathème mutuellement de manière qu'aucun] <sup>2</sup>d'entre nous ne renonce à c[e] dessein[ que nous ayons accompli cette chose. » vac. 6,5 Alors ils jurèrent] <sup>3</sup>tous ensemble et ils se vouè[rent mutuellement] à l'anathème]. 6,6 Et ils étaient en tout deux cents qui descendirent] <sup>4</sup>aux jours de Yéréd sur [le sommet du mont Hermon. Et ils [a]ppelèrent la montagne 'Hermon', parce] <sup>5</sup>qu'ils avaient juré et s'étaient voués [mutuellement à l'anathème dans c[e] dessein.] vac. 6,7 Et voici [les noms de leurs chefs :] <sup>6</sup>Shemihazah qu[i était le premier, Arataq]f le second après lui, Ramshi[el le troisième] <sup>7</sup>après lui, Kôkabie[l le quatrième après lui, Tamiel le cinquième après lui, Ramie[l le sixième après lui,] <sup>8</sup>Daniel le sep[tième après lui, Zîqiel le huitième]me après lui, Baraquel le neuvième après lui,] <sup>9</sup>Asaël le dixième [après lui, Hermoni le onzième]me après lui, Matariel le douzième après lui,] <sup>10</sup>Ananiel le treizième après [lui, Sataou]el (24) le quatorzième après lui, Shamshie[l, le quinzième] <sup>11</sup>après lui, Sahriel le [se]izième après lui, Tûmiel le [dix-]septième [après lui,] <sup>12</sup>Tûriel le di[x]-huitième après lui, Yomi[e]l le

(24) Cette lecture trouve un appui dans la métathèse des consonnes en araméen ou des syllabes du grec *Θαυσανηλ*, tout comme en *αταρκουφ*, de préférence à une forme ancienne *απαθακ* = *\*rqtq*, voir aussi 4QHen<sup>c</sup> *stw' l*, pour une autre proposition, voir Knibb, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

<dix>-neuvième après lui, [et Haddiel le vingtième après lui.] <sup>13</sup>Ceux-ci sont (l)es che[f]s <et> leurs <chefs de> dizai[n]es. **7,1** Eu[x et tous] leurs [com]pagnons [prirent pour eux] <sup>14</sup>des femmes parmi toutes celles qu'ils choisirent et[ ils se mirent à s'unir à elles et à se souiller à leur contact, <sup>15</sup>et à leur enseigner l'exorcisme et[ la magie et la coupe des racines et ils leur montrèrent les herbes] **7,2** <sup>16</sup>et elles conçurent d'eux et [elles] enfan[tèrent des géants, hauts de trois mille coudées qui] <sup>17</sup>apparurent sur la terre[ conformément à leur naissance *et grandirent conformément à leur adolescence*, **7,3** et qui mangeaient] <sup>18</sup>le (fruit du) labeur de tous les hommes, et [les hommes] ne p[urent plus les nourrir. **7,4** Et les géants *les défièrent* (25)] <sup>19</sup>et ils se mirent à tuer les hommes et[ à les manger et à..., **7,5** et ils *provoquèrent la ruine/mort* (26) <sup>20</sup>et ]le deuil de toute la chair des bêtes de [la] terre,[ *et ils se mirent à ... et tous,* <sup>21</sup>ils péch]èrent contre les [oise]aux <et les monstres et[ les poissons de] la mer[> en mangeant la chair[ entre eux ]et[ ils buv]a[ient le sang.] **7,6** A[lors la terre accusa <sup>22</sup>les criminels pour to]ut ce qui[ avait été f]ait (27).[ *vacat*

**8,1** <sup>23</sup>Asaël enseigna aux hommes] à[ fabriquer des épées en fer et des couteaux en bronze et (28)]...

## Les fragments 1f + j + g + h

Le fragment **1f** (+ t de la numérotation de l'a.) ne pose pas de problèmes de lecture.

À la l. 1, l'esquille bien remise en place à la cassure montre une tête caractéristique de *reš*.

À la l. 2, *wtwš*[ est assuré, il n'y a pas de tête permettant de lire *bet* comme le pense l'a. (29).

À la l. 3, le scribe a corrigé le *kaf* fautif en *qof* indiscutable au-dessus de la ligne.

(25) On pourrait envisager un verbe comme *wmrđw bhn* « se révoltèrent contre eux » ou *w't'zw bhn* « les défièrent » que traduirait le grec *ἐπ'ὀλμῆσαν ἐπ' αὐτούς*, ou *wtwbw bhn gbry'* « et les géants se retournèrent contre eux » avec l'éthiopien. Voir d'autres suggestions de l'a., p. 222-23.

(26) Restaurer *e. g.* : *w'tyw mwt* ou *hrbw/n*, « et ils provoquèrent la mort / destruction » coordonné à *w] 'bl* à la ligne suivante. Auparavant, pour l'espace, faudrait-il ajouter en parallèle *wlmšth dmhn* « et à boire leur sang » ?

(27) L'espace demande de traduire *ἀλλήλων* par *bynyhn* et de comprendre soit *wštw*, soit *whww štyh* (voir *4QHen<sup>b</sup>* 1 i 25a) mais un peu plus long pour la ligne. À la l. 22, la lecture proposée semble s'imposer pour l'espace, le sens et le parallèle de *4QHen<sup>b</sup>* 1 i 25b-25, mais en lisant *h]wh* au lieu de *jbh*.

(28) *4QHen<sup>b</sup>* 1 i 26 permet de compléter quelque peu ici, mais en corrigeant *šr[ynyn* en *šk[ynyn*, correspondant ainsi aux traductions.

(29) L'auteur aurait dû ajouter la remarque de la p. 257 concernant *taw* lors de la description paléographique, p. 251, l'absence de tête et le jambage gauche excluent la lecture *bet* et les considérations attenantes, p. 257s.

À la l. 4, la lecture *nḥšy šm[š* est certaine, *ḥet* indiscutable (pas d'axe pour *alef* contrairement à la première lettre de la l. 5) et le tracé à deux obliques parallèles ensuite ne correspond qu'à celui de *šin*, enfin la base de lettre est caractéristique de *mem* ou de *kaf*.

En fin de l. 5, les légères traces entre les deux *lamed* suggèrent de lire le sommet arrondi de *yod*, de préférence aux départs des traits de '*aïn*. Lire donc *wlyl[dyhn* meilleur que *l'l[ymyhn* ou autres proposés par l'a. (p. 262s), mais *l'l[yhn* serait trop long pour l'espace (30). Le mot *yld* « enfant » est connu à Qumrân, en 4Q553 3 1 et 4Q556a 3 5.

Les deux traces sous *reš* et *šin* à la l. 6 ne peuvent être lues qu'avec la restauration du texte et la mise en place des fragments : *qof* et *šin*, voir ci-dessous.

Pour la restauration de *ḥbr[w* à la l. 1, Milik a suivi le schème des substantifs *ššpw whrṯmw* à la l. 2, où il a restauré *k]špw* (31), trois formes nouvelles en araméen et acceptées par l'ensemble des auteurs jusqu'à présent. L'a. note que l'araméen de Daniel emploie '*šp* dans ce contexte et qu'on devrait lire '*špw* d'après l'équivalent akkadien *ašipu*, suivant par là une lecture déjà proposée (32). Mais cette remarque ne résout pas la question de la restauration *ḥbr[w* de l'éditeur (comparer *gbrw* au fragment 1a 6) par *ḥbr[yn* de l'a. rompant la séquence des substantifs abstraits par un concret pluriel, puisque l'araméen connaît l'emploi de *ḥbr(')* « enchanteur », ici « charmes », voir déjà la paire *ḥbr* et *ksp* « incantation et sorcellerie » en *Is* 47,9 et 12. En conséquence, si on peut accepter, sans qu'elle s'impose absolument (33), la lecture '*špw*, on ne le suivra pas pour autant pour le pluriel *ḥbr[yn*, l.1. En revanche on retiendrait le singulier *twš[yh* au lieu du pluriel surprenant retenu par Milik, au sens de « savoir, savoir-faire, industrie ». Le traducteur grec a tout mis au pluriel et donc on n'a pas à le suivre dans ce seul cas.

Le déchiffrement de l'ensemble 1t (p. 265 ss), qui est mis à part bien que parfaitement situé et raccordé à 1f par l'éditeur, ne fait pas de difficulté, et l'a. suit l'éditeur à l'exception du *k[* à la l. 3. Mais la

(30) La lecture *lqbl* de Milik, *op. cit.* p. 157, n'a pas d'appui graphique et elle serait beaucoup trop longue.

(31) Sur le parallèle qu'il croit pouvoir lire en 4QHen<sup>b</sup> 1 ii 19, mais ni *ksp* ni '*sp* ne peut y être lu.

(32) Voir Nickelsburg, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

(33) Voir H. Drawnel, « Between Akkadian *ṭupšarrutu* and Aramaic ספּר: Some Notes on the Social Context of the Early Enochic Literature », *RQ* 95 (2010), 373-403 : « The *ašipu*'s medical profession necessitated the knowledge of incantations, magical and apotropaic rites, medical plants, healings procedures ». On a donc affaire à de la magie et à des exorcismes.

restauration de la l. 1 n'est pas aussi claire; le fragment pris indépendamment, on peut aussi bien lire *slq q[l* « monta un cri », sans suffixe avec le grec, que *q[lhn* « leur cri » aligné sur *qalomu* (34). À la l. 3, l'éditeur a lu *r[š'h*, qui est exclu pour la base de la lettre, et l'a. propose *k[l* qui est paléographiquement acceptable. Il est en effet possible de lire *'tmlyt k[l 'r''/h* « fut remplie to[ute la terre », seule la restauration devrait le confirmer. À la l. 4, on peut hésiter entre un *mem* médial et final, *qdm[*, le tracé convient plus difficilement à un *mem* final.

Le fragment **1g** (partie droite et le fragment 1u = 1g partie gauche) apparaît déjà sur PAM 42.446 et 43.198. La lecture fait peu de difficultés hors les traces de la l. 1 de 1g, sans une restauration du texte. Mais les traces semblent correspondre à *nun* final ou *qof*, puis la base de longueur très moyenne peut être lue *mem/nun/pe*, puis *waw/yod*, et *samek/mem/bet*(?, voir 1f 1). Milik a lu 1g (+ 1u) *wlqbl mbd q[*, mais le *bet* aurait une base beaucoup trop réduite, le *lamed* ne correspondrait pas au tracé habituel et le *mem* aurait un coude très arrondi tout à fait inhabituel. En outre n'est pas transcrit le *'aïn*, et le *qof*, lecture acceptée par l'a., n'aurait pas de tête. Enfin, la plupart des autres lectures de 1u ne sont pas davantage à retenir (35). La meilleure lecture épigraphique de cette ligne de 1g (+ 1u) est *lqnys 'bd d[*, une lecture *lqnwm* serait très difficile pour le *mem*. Il y avait peut-être auparavant une conjonction *kd[* ou mieux une coordination *w[*, voir le grec et l'éthiopien de *1 Hénoch* 8,4. L'espace permettrait en outre la restauration de l'adverbe *'dyn*, même précédé de *waw* ou de *bet* avant les restes conservés de 1g (= l. 6 de cette colonne), à moins d'un *vacat*, voir *1 Hénoch* 9,1.

On note un *mem* médial en position finale dans *dm sgy*, l. 3.

Mais la l. 4 n'a pas encore été correctement déchiffrée, à lire *l[ qtyly']* (36). Les photographies ne révèlent aucune trace de *lamed* sous le jambage tronqué de la première lettre (malgré l'a. p. 280).

(34) L'éditeur (p. 157) comprend *slq q[dm šmyh* suite au joint à distance qui ne permet pas la lecture du *lamed*, et *idem*, « Daniel et Susanne (sic) à Qumrân », *De la Tôrah au Messie. Études d'exégèse et d'herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles pour ses 25 années d'enseignement à l'Institut Catholique de Paris* (Octobre 1979) », sous la direction de M. Carrez, J. Doré et P. Grelot (Paris, 1981), 337-59, p. 347, et note 16 p. 358, où il propose *q[dm bny šmyh]*.

(35) La concordance manuelle, *A preliminary concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic fragments from caves II to X*, Volume V, *Aramaic part, editorum in usum* (Göttingen, 1988), 2327c, lit: *].. lm'bd d[yn] mn 'r''* [ (H.P. Richter ?).

(36) On accepterait difficilement comme vraisemblable la remarque de l'auteur, p. 280, observant l'original, même s'il ne lit pas ce mot (p. 485) pour une lecture *l[qtyly']* de préférence à *l[qtyly']*, pourtant déjà proposé avant lui. Mais PAM 42.446 et 43.198 n'en portent pas de trace et la surface a disparu en cet endroit. N'ayant pas

Sur PAM 42.446, lire ainsi la l. 5 : ]*lbh*], avec la hampe de *lamed* certain et, à la cassure, un départ de trait horizontal au-dessus du milieu du jambage vertical. Si l'identification a été bien faite par l'éditeur, la lecture de la ligne demande la restauration du texte, ce que l'a. refuse de faire, mais il a mal lu ces restes (p. 285) ; il n'a donc pas avancé l'édition, loin de là, l. 4. L'a. a cru bon de séparer sous le sigle 1u la partie gauche qui joint, malgré les affirmations de l'a. qui sont loin d'être confirmées. À la l. 1, PAM 42.446 porte des traces précédant '*bd*', soit un pied de *taw* ou une base de *mem* ou de *bet*, ou autre, trace passée jusque là inaperçue puisque sur PAM 43.198 cette partie est cachée sous le fragment de droite, ce qui prouve que 1u est déformé et rétréci. Cette trace est l'extrémité recourbée du jambage gauche de *samek*, voir un tracé comparable en 1g 3. À la cassure, on devrait lire *dalet*, non *qof* sans tête ou *kaf* proposés par l'a. (p. 385). À la l. 2, lire ]*yk'l*] avec des restes du *yod* de part et d'autre de la cassure, la lettre a une tête marquée sur PAM 42.446, malgré les remarques de la p. 386 à partir de PAM 43.198. Le fragment de droite porte même des traces du coude du *kaf*. À la l. 3, lire ]*šp*], le tracé du *šin* est complet. Pour son identification, suivre l'éditeur à l'œil inégalable, car le fragment joint directement avec 1g, le rétrécissement du cuir ne permet plus un positionnement correct sur toute sa dimension, et la couleur plus sombre suggérerait une cassure ancienne.

Le fragment **1h** doit être replacé dans le contexte de *1 Hénoch* 9 pour les lectures des lettres incomplètes, mais à la l. 2 ]*qlh* est tout à fait possible, malgré l'a., aussi bien que ]*klh*, suivi d'un petit espace, puis tracé de ]*h*] bien préférable à celui de *he*. Et à la l. 4, lire ]*w/yn/r*] comme possibles (*nun* final ?), mais l'épaule semble trop fuyante et basse pour *taw* retenu par l'a., et une lecture *mšw]tn[h* est exclue (p. 292-3).

Le fragment **1j** ne pose pas de grandes difficultés de lecture : à la l. 1, lire vraisemblablement ]*šh*] (37). À la l. 2, la lecture exige une restauration de la ligne : si *wq[lh* proposé par Milik est difficile pour l'espace des traces, la proposition z[ '*q[w* n'est pas acceptable, elle est trop longue malgré la simulation qui doit déporter à gauche le tracé du *qof* et sans trace de '*aïn* attendu. Une lecture *q[lh]n* serait possible et paraît bien préférable. À la l. 3, la lecture ]*wrp'l wgbry'*] est certaine.

vérifié l'original, je le considère comme non préservé. Aux lignes 3 et 4 de ce fragment, on doit rapprocher quelque peu les bords compte tenu du pli qui déforme l'aspect des lettres *samek* et *lamed*.

(37) Milik, *op. cit.* p. 157, a déjà lu *nḥšy] šh[r*, voir *supra* pour cette lecture du nom de la lune.

Voici une proposition de lecture et de restauration de **1f + j + g + h** 1-11 (avec l'aide du parallèle de 4QHen<sup>b</sup> souligné) pour une largeur de colonne estimée à *ca* 13,5-14 cm (38) = *1 Hénoch* 8,3 à 9,3 :

*Marge supérieure*

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| שמי חזה אלף חברו ומקטע שרשין חרמני אלף חרש למשרא                          | 1  |
| אשפו וחרטמו ותושיה ברקאל אלף נחשי ברקין כוכבאל אלף                        | 2  |
| נחשי כוכבין זיכ} <א[ל אלף נחשי זיקין ארעתקף אלף נחשי ארע                  | 3  |
| שמשיאל אלף נחשי שמ[ש שהריאל אלף נחשי] ש[ה]ר וכלהן שריו                    | 4  |
| לגליה ריזין לנשיהין וליל[דיהן ו(?) קניס עבד ד[אנשא אבדו ו] מן ארעא ק[לה]ן | 5  |
| סלק ק[דם בני] ש[מיה (ח/ב) אדין] אדיק מיכאל[ו] ושריאל[ו] ורפאל וגבריא[ל]   | 6  |
| מן קדש[י] שמיה על ארעא וחזו[ו] דמ סגי שפ[ך] על ארעא וכל[ן] רשעה די        | 7  |
| אתמלית כל[ן] ארעא ו[חמסה די] קטיליא[ן] ושמעין ארבעתה עללו[ן]              | 8  |
| ואמרו קדמ[יהן] אשתמע[ן] קלה ח[ב]ל בח[רבות ארעא] בגבריא סלקין עד[ן]        | 9  |
| תרעי שמי[ה] ואמרו לקדי[ש]י ש[מיה כען לכן] אנתן קדישי שמי[ה]               | 10 |
| די קבלן[ן] נפשת בני אנשא ואמר[ן]  | 11 |

8,3<sup>1</sup> Shemihazah enseigne les charm[es et la coupe des racines, Hermoni enseigne les exorcismes, <sup>2</sup>la] magie et la sorcellerie et le savoir-[faire, Baraqiel enseigne les signes du tonnerre, Kôkabiël enseigne <sup>3</sup>les si]gnes des étoiles, Zîqie[l enseigne les signes des météores, Arataqif enseigne les signes de la terre, <sup>4</sup>Sham]shiel enseigne les signes du sole[il, Shahriel enseigne les signes de ]la lu[ne, et tous se mirent <sup>5</sup>à révélé]r des mystères à leurs femmes et à [leurs] enfa[nts. 8,4 Mais(?) ]l'œuvre fut punie parce que[ les hommes périssaient, alors ]de la terre, [leu]r c[ri] <sup>6</sup>monta de[vant les fils des ]c[ieux. 9,1 Alors] Michel[, Sariel, ]Raphaël et Gabriel jetèrent un regard <sup>7</sup>depuis les sanctuaire[s célestes sur la terre et ils vir]ent beaucoup de sang répan[du sur ]la[ terre] et tout[ le mal dont] <sup>8</sup>était remplie tou[te la terre, et] la violence qui (avait été faite) aux tués[, 9,2 et (l')entendant, les quatre (archanges) entrèrent] <sup>9</sup>et dirent en [leur] présence[ : « A été entendue (?) ]la clameur, une ru[in]e par la dé[vastation de la terre par les géants, montant jusqu' ] <sup>10</sup>aux portes des cieux ». 9,3 Et ils dirent aux sai]nts des ci[eux] : « Maintenant c'est vous, vous les saints des cieux, ] <sup>11</sup>que [les âmes des fils des hommes] accusent, [ et ils dise]nt[...]

Cette proposition de lecture des lignes 5-6, non intégralement justifiée dans cette note, explique assez bien les traductions grecques et éthiopiennes, en particulier le grec du Syncelle dans la finale de 8,3, mais dans une formulation un peu différente en 8,3-4 : *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἤρξαντο οἱ γίγαντες κατεσθίειν τὰς σάρκας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ*

(38) Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 139, estime la largeur de la colonne à 13 cm, en particulier pour les lignes 4 à 7 et 9-10. En revanche, cette largeur conviendrait pour les fragments 1k+6+7+n.

ἤρξαντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐλαττοῦσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐβόησαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν περὶ τῆς κακώσεως αὐτῶν λέγοντες εἰσενεχθῆναι τὸ μνημόσυον αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον κυρίου (39). Mais le manuscrit C porte en 8,4 : τῶν οὖν ἀνθρώπων ἀπολλυμένων ἢ βο[ῆ] εἰς οὐρανὸς ἀνέβη. La finale de la l. 7 pourrait porter deux mots, *e. g.* *rš'h dy*, faisant alors office de complément du verbe à la l. 8, « ... et ils vir]ent beaucoup de sang répan[du sur ]la[ terre] et tout[ *le mal dont*] <sup>8</sup>fut remplie tou[te la terre, et] la violence qui (a été faite) aux tués[,...] », les deux termes *rš'h* et *hms̄h* que traduit cette fois encore le grec du Syncelle en 9,2 : καὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀνομίαν γενομένην ἐπ' αὐτῆς. La restauration *rš'h dy*, l. 7, conviendrait à l'espace et serait parallèle à *whms̄h dy*, l. 8. La fin de la l. 8 est restaurée *ad sensum* en partie avec le grec du Syncelle (40), mais sans trouver une correspondance, l. 9, entre *qdm[yhn]* et *πρὸς ἀλλήλους* du grec. Puis lire *ad sensum* pour l'espace *e. g.* *dšmy'* de préférence à *dslyq* qui vient plus loin dans la ligne, ou mieux encore lire *'štm'* pour un discours direct. Il est possible que le copiste ait oublié un *waw* devant *h[b]l*. Pour la suite, voir aussi l'éthiopien : *qâla š'erahati homu* 'erâqâ šarhat m'd'r. On insère pour l'espace et les traces en 4QHen<sup>b</sup> 1 iii 10 (= t 1) le mot *bgbry'* (41). Enfin la reconstruction matérielle demande de changer les lectures de lh 4 proposées par l'éditeur ainsi que celles de l'a. L'éthiopien y est le plus proche de l'araméen.

### Les fragments 1k + 7 + 6 + 1n

La lecture de l'éditeur à la l. 3 de **1k** est bien préférable à celle de l'a. qui doit forcer pour lire *ywb]d*, pas de tête de *dalet* mais de *kaf* final, pour placer ce fragment en *1 Hen* 1,8-9, contrairement à l'éditeur en *1 Hen* 9,6-8. À la l. 1, une lecture *nwr]*' *w[* de l'a. est clairement impossible pour l'écartement assez régulier des lignes de ces fragments. On doit lire *nun/qofl...* et *dalet/waw* mais très difficilement

(39) Voir Black, *Apocalypsis Henoch Graece*, *op. cit.*, p. 22-23.

(40) Avec Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

(41) Milik a lu en correction supralinéaire *bhrb]wt <b[ny]>* 'r[', lecture que conteste A. Caquot, « Hébreu et araméen. Séminaires », *Annuaire du Collège de France* 77 (1977) p. 532: le syntagme reconstitué « fils de la terre » n'apparaît dans aucune version ». Toutefois, même si la reconstitution du verset 9,2 ne repose que sur un difficile ajustement de lambeaux des manuscrits a et b, elle n'est pas pour autant à négliger, à condition d'une lecture correcte. La trace à gauche du *bet* de ce fragment de 4QHen<sup>b</sup> (PAM 43.203) ne peut être lue *nun* pour *bny*, mais *gimel*, qui paraît devoir être complété en *bg[bry'*, correction sans doute un peu avancée sur la gauche à cause du *lamed* du mot suivant, *slq*. La présence d'une mention des géants ne saurait surprendre ici. En effet, les déchiffrements proposés ci-dessus n'ont pas tous des correspondants dans les versions, dans l'état actuel des publications, à ma connaissance tout au moins.



*kaf* d'après le ductus de cette main, voir 1f 2,7,11 en particulier dans les lignes qui précéderaient ce placement. Pour s'en assurer, il est nécessaire de restaurer le texte à l'aide des versions, mais la proposition de l'a. est loin d'être prouvée et préférable à celle de Milik. On retiendrait comme possible la lecture ]*n d/w*[. Le *waw* au début de 9,7 a la valeur de « ainsi que » reliant *Shemiḥazah* à *Asaël* en dépendance du verbe '*bd* = « et (ce qu'a fait) *Shemiḥazah* auquel... »

Au fragment 7, l. 2, la lecture ]*hms*[ de l'éditeur est assurée, avec *mem* fermé en position médiale, comme il arrive ailleurs dans cette main, malgré les fortes réserves de l'a. et des propositions beaucoup plus difficiles. La l. 3 peut être lue ]*yh*[, seule une identification pourrait en assurer. Étant donné l'écart entre les lignes, la l. 1 peut être lue ]*yn*[.

Au fragment 1n, le blanc avant le *waw*, l. 2, suggérerait un début de mot (?), de préférence à deux mots séparés retenus par l'a., pour des écarts aussi conséquents, voir e. g. le fragment 1a 1,... Mais l'identification de Milik est difficile. On se demande s'il ne faudrait pas le placer avec l'ensemble 1k + 7, ainsi que la proposition ci-dessous tente de le suggérer, sans qu'elle s'impose à coup sûr.

Le fragment 6, à lire ]*h wg*[, semble devoir se situer en 1 *Hen* 9,8, comme proposé ci-dessous (42). Cette lecture est aussi vraisemblable que ]'*w g*[, que l'ont pourrait comprendre e. g. ]*h*['w *g*[*bry*', « les géants ont péché ».

Lire par exemple (43) ainsi le regroupement des fragments 1k + 6 + 7 + 1n, en suivant en partie l'intuition de Milik, mais avec une correction de la l. 1 : une identification en 1 *Hen* 9, 6-11 paraît possible (largeur de colonne estimée à ca 13 cm) :

עבד עסאל די אלף עולין ו]חטאין על ארעא ואודע רוי	1
עלמא די בשמיא די ל]הן יעב[דן ידעי בני אנשא ושמיחזה	2
די לה שלטנא יהבת למ]לך לכל ח[ברוהי ואזלו לבנת אנשי	3
ארעא ושכבו עמהן בנקבן ]ל[א]ס[תאב]ה וג]לו להן כל חטאין	4
]ונשיא אולדה גברין בדי אתמלית כל ארעא מן דמה ו]חמס[	5
]וכען ארו נפשת קטילא קבלן וסלק זעקתן ]עד[ תרעי שמ]יה	6
7 ולא יכ(י)לו למפק מן עולתא די הויה על ארעא ]וי דע אנתה כלה	

(42) Sans qu'on puisse retenir les lectures de l'éditeur, Stuckenbruck, *DJD op. cit.*, p. 6, ni suivre Langlois, *op. cit.*, p. 409s.

(43) Cet essai de restauration avec ses 13 cm environ ne permet pas de retrouver une largeur de colonne correspondante identique à celle du fragment précédent, à moins de variantes ou des lignes légèrement plus courtes, ce qui pourrait s'expliquer si le manuscrit ne portait pas de réglage des colonnes, voir Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 139 : « There were probably no guide-lines, except perhaps the vertical lines which marked off the columns of the text ».

9,6 Tu vois ce qu'<sup>1</sup>a fait Asaël qui a enseigné iniquité[s] et [péchés (com-  
mis) sur la terre et il a révélé les secrets <sup>2</sup>éternels (gardés) dans le ciel  
de sorte que, [jeux, [les experts parmi les hommes] prati[quent ce qu'ils  
ont appris. 9,7 Ainsi que Shemiḥazah <sup>3</sup>auquel Tu avais donné l'au[torité  
sur tous [ses] com[pagnons! 9,8 Et ils sont allés vers les filles des  
hommes de <sup>4</sup>la terre, et ils ont couché avec elles] en [se] so[ui]llan[t] par  
des femmes, [et] ils leur ont ]ré[vélé tous les péché]s. 9,9 [<sup>5</sup>Et les  
femmes enfantèrent des géants par la faute desquels toute la terre s'est  
remplie de sang et] de violence. 9,10 [<sup>6</sup>Et maintenant, voici que les âmes  
des tués accusent et leur plainte monte] jusqu'[aux portes des cie]lux[.  
<sup>7</sup>Et il fut impossible de sortir des abominations commises sur la terre.]  
9,11 Et[ toi, tu ]co[n]nais tout... »

Si cette identification devait s'imposer, comme il semble, le  
manuscrit serait une fois de plus, l. 1, à l'origine du texte grec du  
Syncelle *ἀδικίας καὶ ἀμαρτίας* qui pourrait alors expliquer ou corres-  
pondre à *kl - πάσας* – *kwello* des autres versions sans autres spécifi-  
cations d'après une autre copie araméenne. À la l. 4 du fragment 7 1,  
on pourrait tout aussi bien lire *lhn ḥt'y' 'l]yn* avec l'éthiopien que *lhn  
kl ḥt']yn*, avec le grec mais sans article. À la l. 5, on a restauré *gbryn*  
« des géants » avec le Syncelle et l'éthiopien. À la l. 6, la traduction  
du grec *npšt(' dy) qtyly' z'qn wqbln ]'d[ tr'y šm]yh* est insuffisante  
pour la longueur de la ligne, aussi a-t-on préféré suivre en partie le  
Syncelle et l'éthiopien en lisant *npšt qtyly' qbln wslq z' qhn* (préférable  
à *qlhn*) ]'d[ *tr'y šm]yh*. À la l. 7, on pourrait comprendre *e. g. 'wlt' dy  
hwh 'l* ou *'wlt' mt'bdh 'l*.

## Le fragment 11

Avec les restes des 5 lignes, dont un *vacat* l. 2, le fragment 11 a  
conservé peu de restes pour son identification. La seule séquence un  
peu assurée est ]y<sup>1</sup>tg[l[ à la l. 5, au singulier ou au pluriel, mais la lec-  
ture ]y<sup>1</sup>th l[ de Milik est certainement exclue. Le fragment semble  
devoir se situer tout près de la marge gauche de la colonne. À défaut  
de la restauration du texte, il est impossible de dire que la proposition  
de l'a. de situer le fragment en *1 Hen* 93,9-6 s'impose, comme préfé-  
rable à celle de l'éditeur en 10,3-4 ou ailleurs dans le *Livre des  
Veilleurs*. On en doute d'autant plus qu'aucun autre fragment de ce  
rouleau n'appartient avec certitude à la finale du *Livre d'Hénoch*, ce  
qui va très fortement contre cette proposition (44), d'une part. D'autre

(44) Avec Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 141 : « it seems to me highly probable that the first  
copy of Enoch, as also 4QEn<sup>b</sup>, contained only the first part of the book of Enoch, cor-  
responding to chapters 1-36 of the Ethiopic Enoch ». Il faut donc une identification  
indisputable pour proposer une telle conclusion.

part, les identifications proposées par l'a. à 93,5-6 font difficulté pour la l. 5 en particulier et supposeraient des lignes excessivement courtes dans cette colonne ou un texte très différent de ceux connus par les versions. Aussi, l'absence d'une proposition de restauration des versets en dit long sur la vraisemblance de la proposition.

### Le fragment 1m

Le fragment 1m semble devoir être lu ]šm/s[, plus difficilement ]šb[ (base très courte de *bet* ?), l. 1, et ]mnh[, l. 2, ce qui met en doute le placement proposé par l'éditeur, et explique les hésitations de lecture de l'a. On pourrait proposer en *1 Hen* 32,2 (en suivant *4QHen<sup>e</sup>* : ]šm[wq' et ]mnh[), mais il faut sans doute chercher une position plus proche des chapitres conservés et correctement identifiés.

### Le fragment 1o

On lit au mieux, l. 1 : ]h̄b[ ou h̄]zh[, l. 2 : ] 'hšt[ ]l[, l. 3 : ]tp(?) l̄wn w[, l. 4 : ]wt[ ]r(?)my[ (45), l. 5 : 'mr 'nh[, l. 6 : ]n '[. Aussi la proposition d'identification à *1 Hen* 102,7-10 n'est-elle pas davantage à retenir, qui ne conviendrait que pour la l. 4 d'après l'éthiopien, même s'il était possible encore de lire ]'št[ ' ]l[ 'b'rh ytkn, l. 2, pour *1 Hen* 102,1, car les ll. 3-4 n'ont pas de correspondants dans ces lignes, à moins d'un texte passablement différent. Aussi, de préférence, en attendant une preuve claire et irréfutable, on devrait en rester à un passage du *Livre des Veilleurs*.

### Le fragment 1p

Les quelques restes de ce fragment pourraient être lus ainsi : l. 1 : ] ' n[, l. 2 : ]b/dn b[ ]n[ ]., l. 3 : ]yn d̄[, l. 4 : ]d̄[. Il est impossible de s'assurer des lectures sans un placement dans le texte, mais l'identification de l'éditeur est peu probable.

Les autres fragments qui avaient été retenus par Milik (fragment **1i** d'appartenance douteuse), mais non identifiés, devaient être publiés dans l'*editio princeps* dont fut ensuite chargé Stuckenbruck, *DJD* XXXVI. Leur étude est restée en l'état. L'a. propose des lectures addi-

(45) Le reste de trait oblique tiré à droite lu *mem* pourrait aussi être lu *šin*, par exemple šmy[(hzh) ou autre, aussi bien que *reš*, et une lecture ]wt[̄]rmy[ avec Milik (p. 162) est possible. On pourrait aussi bien lire *e. g.* ml[kwt šmy[h ou ml[kwt 'my[h, etc. Mais il est difficile de comprendre le rapport entre le déchiffrement paléographique de l'a., p. 337s, et sa proposition de lecture, p. 345, malgré la simulation, p. 343.

tionnelles mais discutables. Ainsi au fragment 2 1, la traduction « et ainsi » n'est pas possible, puisqu'une base de lettre est visible sous le *waw*, ]b/n/p/?wkn, on a probablement affaire au suffixe de la deuxième personne du pluriel avec l'éditeur, voir PAM 41.665 : « ils vous ont.[ ». Et à la l. 2, on devrait sans doute lire ]n(?) mpqd bny, « ]. ordonnant aux fils de(s)[ », soit « des cieux, des veilleurs », ou « des hommes, de la terre ». À la l. 3, on lit : « ] avec toutes les œuvres de [ ». À la l. 4, on lit ]hn en finale « ]leur[ ». Puis des restes de deux autres lignes. Mais bien des lectures de l'auteur sont impossibles, tout comme celles de l'éditeur en *DJD XXXVI*, ainsi que la proposition de l'a. d'une identification au *Livre des Géants*.

Le fragment 3 peut être lu au mieux, semble-t-il, ]q yšm[. Et même avec l'aide de l'informatique, le fragment 8 résiste à un déchiffrement quelque peu acceptable, d'autant que le petit fragment en bas à gauche n'est pas en place, sans joint direct, à classer comme 8a. À la l. 1, on pense reconnaître *bet*, à la l. 2, ]yn t[, à la l. 3, lecture possible de ]'d/m[ et plus loin ]l'/h[, à la l. 4, lire peut-être ].mnh šwm/t[, à la l. 5, lire peut-être ]wl' npq[ et ]l[. À la l. 1 de 8a, lire sans doute ]hñwk[ (46), et à la l. 2, ]mrt'/h[. Comme le nom du patriarche Hénoch revient plusieurs fois dans les chapitres de *1 Hénoch* 12-13-14-15, à la suite des chapitres les mieux identifiés, une identification probable pourrait être en *1 Hénoch* 12,3-4, l. 2: 'zl w']mrth[ l'yry dšmyh l. 1 : « ]Hénoch[ », l. 2 : « va et ]tu diras[ aux Veilleurs du ciel », ou mieux encore 15,1-2.

La liste des passages attestés (p. 455-7) dépend de l'exactitude du déchiffrement, et les remarques ci-dessus font très fortement douter des identifications proposées en dehors du *Livre des Veilleurs*, comme celle des fragments 11 en *1 Hénoch* 93,4, 1o en 102,7 et 2 au *Livre des Géants*, propositions certainement à rejeter. Il est clair que les joints proposés par Milik sont à retenir. Les nouvelles identifications proposées ici demandent de réviser celles de l'a. Sur ce point encore, les conclusions de l'a. sont en net recul sur l'édition préliminaire qui reste indispensable et souvent inégale.

Les considérations générales sur l'araméen du manuscrit, phonologie, lexicographie et syntaxe (p. 423-53) dépendent évidemment de la qualité du déchiffrement, par exemple l'emploi du *waw* comme voyelle brève (p. 430s) dans *twmy'l* de lecture assurée. Qu'on ne retrouve pas des traces de l'araméen des targums est une évidence qui

(46) Voir Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 140, en *scriptio plena* comme la correction en 1 1, contrairement à l'a. et à l'éditeur, Stuckenbruck, *DJD XXXVI*.

ne saurait surprendre. La liste des noms angéliques maintenant assurée demande de revoir plusieurs interprétations plus que discutables et même à rejeter (p. 441-47) (47). Il est très douteux que dans *lbḥ[yryn* en 1c 1, le *lamed* soit accusatif avec un substantif à l'état absolu (p. 449), il doit être la préposition dans l'expression « dire une bénédiction pour X », ce qui explique bien mieux la lecture et la construction proposée par Milik lisant *bh]n* auparavant, restauration nécessaire pour un alignement à la marge (voir ci-dessus).

Il va de soi qu'une datation de la composition est toujours délicate. La plus claire est la datation paléographique, déjà donnée par Milik dans la première moitié du II<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C., car il est impossible de savoir si un copiste a, ou n'a pas, introduit dans sa copie des formes grammaticales contemporaines et plus tardives. Quant aux affinités avec l'araméen galiléen et samaritain, on ne peut pas dire grand-chose étant donné l'absence de textes littéraires de cette époque pour une comparaison.

Au terme de cette lecture attentive du livre, on ne peut pas dire que nous est donnée une « nouvelle *editio princeps* » !

Un gros travail reste encore à faire sur ce manuscrit dans le prolongement de l'étude ci-dessus, en essayant de compléter manuellement, par une restauration à partir des versions, d'autres passages pour une mise en colonne acceptable des sept petits fragments qui restent encore à identifier, seule manière de remettre en place des fragments qui appartiennent manifestement au même contexte, pour retirer quelques renseignements supplémentaires de ce document. Les corrections, propositions, identifications et restaurations présentées ici ont pour but avant tout de signaler ce à quoi pouvait ressembler, dans ces quelques colonnes, la copie du texte araméen de ce manuscrit de la grotte 4 qui a conservé les premiers chapitres du livre, et elles souhaitent faire avancer l'étude des textes hénochiens dans les traductions grecques et éthiopiennes que l'étude préliminaire et magistrale de Milik a mise sur de bons rails.

Émile PUECH  
CNRS - EBAF

(47) Voir Sokoloff, *cit.*, p. 207, pour une interprétation et traduction correctes.

## TABLES DU TOME XXIV

### AUTEURS CITÉS

- Abate (E.) 460s  
Abegg (M.) 97; 136; 142; 355;  
370; 444; 589; 590; 602; 618  
Abusch (T.) 386; 397  
Adamczewski (B.) 301  
Adams (E.) 301  
Adams (S.L.) **555-583**  
Adan-Bayewitz (D.) 301  
Adler (W.) 464  
Adler (Y.) 301  
Aitken (J.) 464  
Albertz (R.) 160  
Alexander (Ph.) 88; 136; 148; 90;  
92; 291; 369s; 464; 596; 622  
Allegro (J.M.) 81ss; 283; 288;  
359  
Allison (D.C.) 427  
Andersen (F.) 464  
Anderson (G.) 464  
Anderson (K.) 301  
Angel (A.) 301  
Angel (J.) **585-605**  
Appelbaum (A.) 464  
Arav (R.) 301  
Arcari (L.) 301  
Arendzen (J.) 518; 553  
Argall (R.A.) 581  
Ariel (D.) 464  
Arnold (R.) 302  
Atkinson (K.) 302; 464  
Attridge (W.) 464; 581  
Ausloos (H.) 464  
Avemarie (F.) 464  
Avery-Peck (A.J.) 93  
Avioz (M.) 464  
Baasten (M.F.J.) 80  
Bader (M.A.) 464  
Baillet (M.) 57; 352; 369; 435;  
586ss; 590; 600  
Bainbridge (W.S.) 189; 212  
Baker (C.M.) 464  
Bakhos (C.) 93  
Balla (M.) 175; 185; 192  
Bar-Asher (M.) 456  
Barclay (J.) 302  
Barkay (R.) 206  
Barker (M.) 302  
Bar-Kochva (B.) 302  
Barlett (M.L.) 206  
Bar-Nathan (R.) 177; 184; 191;  
206  
Barrick (W.) 464  
Barstad (H.) 157  
Barthélemy (D.) 150; 274ss; 331;  
604  
Barthes (R.) 187; 206  
Barton (J.) 465  
Batsch (Ch.) 298; 302  
Bauckaham (R.) 10  
Bauer (H.) 397; 454; 302  
Baumgarten (J.) 14; 89; 117; 121;  
138; 140; 141; 145; 146; 147;  
200; 202; 227; 291; 356; 406s;  
412; 442; 444; 450; 465  
Baumgarten (A.) 358; 206

- Baumgartner (W.) 16; 119  
 Bautch (K.) 465; 465  
 Beaulieu (P.-A.) 375; 377; 397  
 Beckwith (R.) 466  
 Bedenbender (M.) 302  
 Begg (C.T.) 47  
 Bella (M.) 439  
 Bellinger (W.H., Jr.) 274  
 Ben Yehudah (E.) 406  
 Ben-David (E.) 614  
 Bennett Elder (L.) 357  
 Ben-Yehoshua (Sh.) 466  
 Berg (S.A.) 607; 302  
 Bergmann (C.) 302s  
 Berlin (A.) 181s; 206  
 Berner (Ch.) 466  
 Bernier (J.) 303  
 Bernstein (M.) 10; 13; 53; 87;  
     140; 357; 422; 444  
 Berrin (Sh.) 81; 83  
 Berthelot (K.) 8; 12; 467  
 Beyer (K.) 36; 69; 70; 72; 73; 74;  
     418; 594  
 Beyerle (S.) 303  
 Bhayro (S.) 303; 397; 382; 467  
 Bickerman (E.J.) 364  
 Biddle (M.E.) 55  
 Bienowski (P.) 82  
 Bird (P.) 55  
 Birenboim (H.) 467  
 Black (M.) 633s; 644  
 Blanton (Th.) 303  
 Blenkinsopp (J.) 273; 467  
 Boccaccini (G.) 303  
 Böck (M.) 380; 397  
 Bockmuehl (M.) 467  
 Bohak (G.) 468  
 Bond (H.K.) 303  
 Bonnard (P.E.) 277  
 Bonnington (M.) 303  
 Bord (L.-J.) 297  
 Bordieu (P.) 206  
 Borgonovo (G.) 468  
 Bormann (L.) 468  
 Bottéro (J.) 380; 386; 388; 391;  
     394; 397  
 Botterweck (G.J.) 16  
 Böttrich (C.) 468  
 Boustán (R.) 303; 468  
 Bowley (J.E.) 618  
 Boyce (M.) 139  
 Boyd-Taylor (C.) 303; 468  
 Braulik (G.) 5; 615  
 Bremmer (J.) 303  
 Brenner (A.) 408  
 Breytenbach (C.) 43  
 Briggs (C.A.) 16; 119  
 Britton (J.) 397  
 Brockelmann (C.) 385; 398  
 Brooke (G.) 79-95; 132; 151; 227;  
     304; 332; 468s; 572  
 Broshi (M.) 175ss; 176; 185; 186;  
     191s; 197; 198; 206; 213; 440;  
     455  
 Brown (F.) 16; 119; 157  
 Brownlee (W.H.) 85; 276ss; 280;  
     622  
 Bruce (F.J.) 80  
 Brucker (R.) 304  
 Burchard (Ch.) 518; 552  
 Burdajewicz (M.) 180s; 207  
 Burks (J.M.) 192; 211  
 Burrows (M.) 273s; 277  
 Byron (J.) 304  
 Cagni (L.) 374; 398  
 Caldach-Benages (N.) 304; 469  
 Callaway (Ph.) 304  
 Camp (C.V.) 559  
 Campbell (J.G.) 23  
 Cancik (H.) 136  
 Cansdale (L.) 176; 184; 193; 207;  
     457  
 Capelli (P.) 304  
 Cappelletti (S.) 304  
 Capponi (L.) 304  
 Caquot (A.) 644  
 Cardellini (I.) 278  
 Cargill (R.) 469  
 Carmichael (C.) 469  
 Carmignac (J.) 15; 515  
 Carrez (M.) 641  
 Casey (M.) 304  
 Catto (S.) 304  
 Cazelles (H.) 279; 385; 398  
 Ceulemans (R.) **331-349**  
 Chalcraft (D.) 152  
 Chambon (A.) 179; 180; 182;  
     191; 201; 207; 209  
 Chapman (D.W.) 305



- Charles (R.H.) 231; 236; 250; 255; 383; 392; 398  
 Charlesworth (J.) 11; 14; 137; 283; 291; 296; 305; 364; 421; 422; 588; 602; 607s; 618; 625  
 Chazon (E.) 270; 305; 357; 586; 598; 624; 21; 9; 370; 140; 39; 52  
 Chesnutt (R.D.) 305  
 Chialà (S.) 305  
 Chilton (B.) 305; 469  
 Christiansen (E.J.) 305; 470  
 Cieciela (J.) 305  
 Claussen (C.) 9; 305  
 Clements (R.) 158; 159; **301-328**; **463-511**; 624  
 Clines (D.) 36; 118; 406; 470  
 Coggins (R.J.) 90  
 Cohen (C.) 182; 470  
 Cohn (Y.) 470; 305  
 Colautti (F.) 305  
 Collins (J.J.) 158; 159; 160; 162; 281; 305; 357; 471; 521; 552; 559; 564; 565; 572; 574; 575ss; 581; 588; 589; 592; 596; 601  
 Cook (E.) 305; 618; 66; 150; 69; 77; 83  
 Corley (J.) 471; 306  
 Costa (T.) 306  
 Cothenet (E.) 15  
 Cowley (J.) 417  
 Cox (S.) 306  
 Crom (D. de) **331-349**  
 Croom (A.) 207; 202  
 Cross (F.M.) 62; 436; 437; 438; 440; 610  
 Crowe (B.D.) 306  
 Crown (D.) 176; 207; 457  
 Croy (N.) 471  
  
 Dahmen (U.) **3-6**; 50; 609ss; 622  
 Daise (M.A.) 306; 471  
 DandamaYev (M.A.) 374; 398  
 Davenport (G.) 215  
 David (T.) 471  
 Davidson (M.J.) 426  
 Davies (M.Th.) 166  
 Davies (Ph.R.) 132; 136; 138; 207  
 Davila (J.) 370; 471; 600s  
 Davis (M.T.) 616  
 Day (P.L.) 43  
 De Troyer (K.) 471  
 Debel (H.) 471  
 Del Olmo Lete (G.) 398  
 Delatte (A.) 387; 398  
 Delcor (M.) 360  
 Dempster (S.) 80; 471  
 Denis (A-M.) 634  
 Dennill (G.B.) 471  
 Descamp (M.Th.) 472  
 Di Lella (A.A.) 42; 472  
 Dieter (M.) 207  
 Dietler (M.) 207; 187  
 Dihi (H.) 472  
 Dijkhuizen (P.) 307  
 Dimant (D.) 4; **8-18**; 20ss; 45; 81; 87; 140; 168; 216; 266; 299; 422; 429; 457s; 472; 587s; 624  
 Dines (J.) 473  
 Ditommaso (L.) 307  
 Dobos (D.) 473; 473  
 Docherty (S.E.) 88  
 Dochhorn (J.) 473  
 Doering (L.) 307; 473  
 Donceel (R.) 176ss; 180; 191; 193; 200; 207; 439; 457  
 Doré (J.) 641  
 Doudna (G.) 177; 207; 307  
 Douglas (M.) 187s; 207  
 Drawnel (H.) 40; 398; **373-403**; **517-554**; 640  
 Driel (V.) 398  
 Driver (G.) 83  
 Driver (S.R.) 16; 119  
 Drower (E.) 385; 398  
 Du Toit (M.) 307  
 Dubs (J.-C.) 297; 473  
 Duhaime (J.) 421; 586  
 Duhm (H.) 43  
 Duke (R.) 524; 553  
 Dumont (L.) 198; 207  
 Duncan (J.A.) 365  
 Dupont-Sommer (A.) 281; 381; 398 457  
 Dušek (J.) 37; 434  
  
 Ebeling (E.) 381; 398  
 Eck (W.) 307  
 Edwards (D.) 473  
 Egger-Wenzel (R.) 307; 473

- Ego (B.) 307; 473  
 Ehrenkrook (J.) 307  
 Einwohner (R.L.) 209; 191  
 Ejrnæs (B.) 474  
 Ekblad (E.R.) 275  
 Elgvin (T.) **155-163** ; 307; 474; 563  
 Elior (R.) 474; 474  
 Elledge (C.D.) 307; 607; 623s; 625  
 Ellens (J.H.) 308  
 Ellis (E.E.) 91  
 Elwolde (J.) 258; 308; 80  
 Endres (J.) 474  
 Erho (T.) 474  
 Eshel (E.) 39; 424; 586; 589; 592; 594; 595s  
 Eshel (H.) 207; 208; 175; 176; 185; 186; 191s; 195; 195; 197; 198; 200; 201; 206; 213; 308; 436; 438; 440; 474s  
 Evans (C.) 80; 91; 221; 270; 370; 475; 619; 608  
  
 Fabry (H.-J.) 62; 135; 136; 137; 140; 149; **165-172**; 308  
 Falk (D.) 308; 475; 603  
 Farber (W.) 376; 398  
 Farmer (W.R.) 274  
 Fassberg (S.) 61; 66; 73; 76; 475  
 Faust (A.) 205; 208  
 Fearghail (F.) 593  
 Feder (F.) 308  
 Feldman (L.) 475; 476; 534; 553  
 Ferguson (L.) 191; 208  
 Fernandez Marcos (N.) 363; 364  
 Fields (W.W.) 614  
 Fink (U.B.) 308  
 Fisher 181s; 191; 196; 208  
 Fitzmyer (J.) 63; 69; 73; 74; 308; 361  
 Fleischer (E.) 253  
 Flemming (J.) 388  
 Flesher (L.S.) 308  
 Fletcher-Louis (C.) 308s; 563; 591s; 593; 596; 603  
 Flint (P.) 50; 136; 160; 175ss; 213; 355; 357; 361; 362; 370; 444; 608ss  
 Floyd (M.H.) 309  
 Flusser (D.) 40; 44; 266  
 Folmer (M.L.) 63; 70; 73  
 Foster (P.) 309  
 Fowler (A.) 545; 553  
 Fox (M.) 237  
 Fraade (S.D.) 577  
 Freedman (D.N.) 393s; 398; 608; 613  
 Frennesson (B.) 600  
 Freund (R.A.) 477  
 Frey (J.) 9; 422; 477; 522s; 553; 568  
 Friedman (D.N.) 11  
 Friesen (J.W.) 192  
 Fröhlich (I.) 22; 23  
 Fronzaroli (P.) 25  
 Fuhrmann (S.) 309  
 Furstenberg (Y.) 309  
  
 Galor (K.) 358; 437; 198s; 208  
 Garcia Martinez (F.) 4; 8; 10; 37; 58; 89; 90; 137; 140; 150; 158; 167s; 208; 227; 274; 287; 289; 291; 309; 359s; 361; 406s; 422; 442; 444; 455; 457s; 459; 515; 516; 569; 586; 590; 592; 600; 603; 628  
 Garnet (P.) 137  
 Garrett (D.) 354  
 Gartner 93  
 Gasperoni (A.) 278  
 Gaster (T.H.) 43  
 Gathercole (S.) 309  
 Gault (B.F.) **351-371**  
 Gehlken (E.) 391; 398  
 Geiger (G.) **453-456**  
 Geller (M.) 380; 398  
 Gemünden (P. von) 309  
 Gentry (P.J.) 332  
 Gershenson (D.E.) 42  
 Gertner (M.) 79  
 Gesche (P.) 379; 398  
 Gesenius (W.) 406  
 Gianotto (C.) 309  
 Gianto (A.) 373  
 Gibson (Sh.) 309  
 Gichon (M.) 181s; 191; 196; 208  
 Gilbert (M.) 309  
 Gilders (W.K.) 242  
 Ginzberg (L.) 117

- Godman (Ll.) **421-432**  
 Goff (M.) 162; 309; 359; 556s;  
 562; 564; 568; 569; 572; 580;  
 581  
 Golb (N.) 176ss; 208; 457  
 Golberg (Sh.) 309  
 Goldman (L.) 140; 478  
 Goldschmidt (D.) 220  
 Goldstein (J.) 250  
 Goodblatt (D.) 478  
 Goodman (D.) 309  
 Goodman (M.) 292; 356; 478  
 Goody (J.) 187; 208  
 Gordley (M.E.) 310  
 Gordon (C.) 150; 381  
 Görg (M.) 42  
 Goshen Gottstein (M.) 361; 453;  
 609 611ss; 622  
 Grabbe (L.L.) 310; 478  
 Gransey (P.) 187; 194; 208  
 Grappe (Ch.) 297; 299s  
 Gray (P.) 310  
 Green (W.S.) 93; 310; 478  
 Greenfield (J.) 39; 63; 72; 398;  
 519; 553; 608  
 Gregg (B.H.) 310  
 Greimas (A.J.) 80  
 Grelot (P.) 274; 279s; 534; 536s;  
 553; 641  
 Gross (W.) 615  
 Grossberg 194; 208  
 Grossman (M.) 50; 138; 139; 145;  
 146; 151; 169; 310; 478  
 Grossmark (Z.) 201; 202; 208  
 Gruber (M.I.) 93  
 Gruen (E.S.) 478  
 Guglielmo (L.) 310  
 Guillaume (A.) 277; 310; 478  
 Guise Sheridan (S.) 358  
 Gunneweg (J.) 175; 185; 192;  
 208; 435; 439  
 Gurtner (D.M.) 310  
 Gusella (L.) 478  
 Gussmann (O.) 479  
 Gyselen (R.) 439  
 Gzella (H.) 5; **61-78** ; 479  
  
 Haag (H.) 44  
 Haaland (G.) 479  
 Haber (S.) 310  
 Hachlili (R.) 195; 196; 208; 310  
 Hadot (J.) 573  
 Hagedorn (A.C.) 355  
 Hahn (D.) 212  
 Hakola (R.) 310  
 Halpern (B.) 11; 423; 613  
 Hamidović (D.) 287ss; 290; **283-**  
**286** ; 298  
 Hamitovsky (I.) 479  
 Hannah (D.D.) 479  
 Hanson (J.) 209  
 Haran (M.) 479  
 Hardin (J.K.) 310  
 Harkins (A.) 585  
 Harmon (M.) 311  
 Harrington (D.) 5; 57; **97-114** ;  
 159; 311; 555; 557; 593  
 Hartsock (Ch.) 311  
 Hayden (B.) 186; 187; 207; 208  
 Hayes (J.H.) 83  
 Hays-Gilpin (K.) 201; 208  
 Hayward (C.T.R.) 593  
 Heeßel (N.) 380; 394; 398  
 Heger (P.) **441-451**; 93; 94  
 Hempel (Ch.) 5; 8; 22; 141; **135-**  
**153**; 170s; 205; 208; 311; 480;  
 557; 568; 572; 578  
 Hendon (J.A.) 187; 188; 208  
 Hengel (M.) 275; 281; 588; 137;  
 273  
 Henten (J.W. van) 311; 408; 480  
 Henze (M.) 81; 311; 480  
 Herbert (D.) 355  
 Hermisson (H.J.) 277  
 Herr (B.) 480  
 Hershkovitz (M.) 480  
 Hess (R.S.) 362S  
 Hidiroglou (P.) 208  
 Hiebert (R.J.V.) 480  
 Hilhorst (A.) 12; 137; 430; 436  
 Hillier (B.) 209  
 Himmelfarb (M.) 311; 480  
 Hirschfeld (Y.) 176; 177; 186;  
 191; 193; 196; 197; 198; 209  
 Hodder (I.) 179; 209  
 Höffken (P.) 311s  
 Hoftijzer (J.) 418  
 Hogan (P.) 312  
 Høgenhaven (J.) 480  
 Hogeterp (A.) 312; 481

- Holladay (C.R.) 553  
 Holladay (W.L.) 431  
 Hollander (H.W.) 528; 553  
 Hollander (J.A.) 191; 209  
 Holtz (G.) 481  
 Honigman (S.) 481  
 Hopkins (J.-D.) 481  
 Horgan (M.) 82ss; 151; 283; 287ss  
 Horrell (D.G.) 312  
 Horsley (R.) 559; 580  
 Horst (P.W. van der) 312  
 Hossfeld (S.-L.) 136  
 Hostetler (J.A.) 192; 209  
 Houlden (J.L.) 90  
 House (P.R.) 354  
 Houtman (A.) 312  
 Huber Vulliet (W.) 377s  
 Hultgren (S.) 13; 140; 481  
 Humbert (K.) 175ss; 176; 177; 180; 182; 186; 208s; 358  
 Hunger (H.) 373; 377; 392; 398; 435; 437; 457  
 Huston (S.) 179; 209  
  
 Ibba (G.) 312; 481  
 Ilan (T.) 312  
 Ingalaere (J.-C.) 297; 299s  
 Isherwood (B.) 188; 207  
  
 Jackson (B.) 481  
 Jacobson (D.) 481  
 Jacobus (H.R.) 481  
 Janowski (B.) 273; 274; 277; 481  
 Jarick (J.) 370  
 Jassen (A.P.) 481; 312  
 Jastrow (M.) 118; 119; 121; 122; 124; 125; 126; 128; 130; 131  
 Jefferies (D.F.) 561  
 Jefferson (T.) 209  
 Jenni (E.) 55  
 Jeppersen (K.) 157  
 Jobes (K.H.) 364  
 Johns (L.L.) 313  
 Jokiranta (J.) 140; 152; 313; 482s  
 Jonge (M. de) 552  
 Jongeling (K.) 418  
 Joosten (J.) 406  
 Jordaan (P.J.) 313  
  
 Kahana (M.) 409  
 Kampen (J.) 10; 140; 371; 422; 444  
 Kapera (Z.) 176; 209; 313  
 Karrer (M.) 483  
 Kartveit (M.) 483  
 Katzoff (R.) 483  
 Kaufman (S.A.) 69; 72; 398  
 Kedar-Kopfstein (B.) 454  
 Keith (P.) 313  
 Kelley (M.A.) 197; 211  
 Ketola (K.) 483  
 Kim (J.-H.) 483; 483  
 Kister (M.) 9; 140; 162; 216; 258; 260; 261; 266; 313; 369; 422; 424; 483; 483s  
 Klawans (J.) 252  
 Klein (A.) 484; 418s  
 Klinghardt (M.) 294  
 Klinzig (A.) 136  
 Kloppenborg (J.S.) 313  
 Klostergaard Petersen (A.) 88  
 Knibb (M.A.) 137; 142; 151; 313; 292; 629; 638  
 Knohl (I.) 313; 484; 589; 591  
 Kobelski (P.) 422; 428; 431; 517; 553  
 Koch (K.) 313  
 Koehler (L.) 16; 119  
 Kohn (R.) 485  
 Kolarcik (M.) 485  
 Kol-Yaakov (S.) 209  
 Komlosh (Y.) 276  
 Kooij (A. van der.) 485  
 Koskenniemi (E.) 313  
 Kottsieper (I.) 485; **405-419**  
 Kraft (A.) 87; 331; 614  
 Kratz (G.) 160; 485  
 Kraus (H.-J.) 42  
 Krauter (S.) 314  
 Krauthammer (S.) 205  
 Kraybill (D.B.) 191; 192  
 Kreuzer (F.) 43; 314  
 Kryško 175; 192; 210  
 Kugel (J.) **215-272** ; 444; 485  
 Kugler (R.) 40; 50; 136; 148; 167; 204; 209; 519; 553  
 Kuhrt (A.) 374ss; 398  
 Kutscher (E.Y.) 62; 75; 280; 453  
 Kvanvig (H.S.) 314  
 Kvasnica (B.) 485

- Labat (R.) 380; 398  
 Lacoudre (N.) 438  
 Lambert (D.) 268  
 Lanfranchi (P.) 314; 485  
 Lange (A.) 5; 21; 22; 24; **35-48**;  
     51; 62; 156; 158; 170; 314; 355;  
     486; 557; 568; 569ss; 572; 578;  
     580; 603  
 Langlois (M.) 383; 459; 486;  
     628ss  
 Laperrousaz (E.-M.) 175ss; 196;  
     209  
 Larson (E.) 314  
 Latour (J.-B.) 486  
 Leander (P.) 454  
 Leaney (A.R.C.) 292  
 Lefkovits (J.K.) 132  
 Legrand (Th.) 486  
 Lemaire (A.) 87; 435; 437; 438;  
     439; 457; 458  
 Lemche (N.P.) 159  
 Lemos (T.M.) 314  
 Lenzi (G.) 314  
 Leslau (W.) 385; 400  
 Leveen (J.) 275  
 Levenson (D.B.) 487  
 Lévi Strauss (C.) 127; 187; 209;  
     314; 487  
 Levine (L.I.) 118  
 Levinson (B.M.) 487  
 Levy (J.) 191; 209; 406  
 Licht (J.) 603  
 Lichtenberger (H.) 9; 40s; 136;  
     314; 487; 557; 568; 572; 578  
 Licona (M.R.) 315  
 Lidonnici (L.) 564  
 Lieber (A.) 564  
 Lieberman (S.) 117; 127; 128  
 Lied (L.I.) 315  
 Lier (G.E.) 315  
 Liesen (J.) 487; 575  
 Lightstone (J.) 315; 487  
 Lim (Th.) 315; 487; 91  
 Lindqvist (P.) 488  
 Lingée (H.) 15  
 Little (B.) 181; 188; 209  
 Liver (J.) 136  
 Loader (W.) 357; 488  
 Lockett (D.) 488  
 Lohse (E.) 407  
 Longman (T.) 359  
 Loraux (N.) 210  
 Lourié (B.) 488  
 Luomanen (P.) 140  
 Machiela (D.) 488  
 Macuch (R.) 385  
 Magen (Y.) 76; 176; 177; 177;  
     180; 184; 186; 191; 193; 194;  
     196; 197; 198; 210; 438; 437  
 Magness (J.) 9; 50; 175ss; 176;  
     177; 180; 181; 182s; 185; 186;  
     191; 193; 194; 196; 196; 199;  
     201; 202; 210  
 Maier (J.) 92ss; 94s  
 Maisel (D.) 589  
 Mandel (P.) 93; 94  
 Mankiewicz (S.) 165  
 Maori (Y.) 253  
 Marböck (J.) 579  
 Marciak (M.) 488  
 Marquis (G.) 488; 162  
 Martone (C.) 281; 315; **460-461** ;  
     515; 516  
 Marttila (M.) 488  
 Marx (A.) 298  
 Mason (S.) 316; 488s  
 Maul (S.) 386; 400  
 Mayer (W.R.) 373  
 Mayes (A.D.H.) 88  
 Mbuvi (A.M.) 316  
 McCane (B.R.) 316  
 McDonald (L.M.) 316; 625  
 McEvenue (S.E.) 615  
 McEwan (G.) 374; 376s; 379;  
     395; 400  
 McGuire (R.H.) 189; 196; 210  
 McNamara (M.) 419  
 Mee (C.B.) 82  
 Meer (M.N. van der) 612  
 Meier (J.P.) 116  
 Merklein (H.) 276  
 Meskell (L.) 210; 179  
 Metso (S.) 137; 5; 140; 171s; 177  
 Mézange (Ch.) 299  
 Michniewicz (J.) 175; 192; 210  
 Milgrom (J.) 129; 245; 421  
 Milik (J.) 81; 86; 160; 269; 352;  
     383; 384; 391; 392; 400; 426;  
     428; 431; 435; 437; 440; 455;

- 459; 459; 517s; 521; 553; 604; 627ss  
 Miller (D.) 210  
 Miller (E.) 591  
 Miller (J.B.F.) 179; 316  
 Mimouni (S.) 87; 439; 457; 459  
 Minissale (A.) 490  
 Misgav (H.) 76  
 Mitchell (D.) 316; 490  
 Mittmann-Richert (U.) 490  
 Mizrahi (N.) 490  
 Mizzi (D.) 210  
 Mohrmann (D.C.) 316  
 Moore (A.) 490  
 Mor (U.) 490  
 Moren (S.) 393; 400  
 Mosser (C.) 490  
 Mosshammer (A.) 383; 400  
 Moynihan Gillihan (Y.) 291-296  
 Mroczek (E.) 316; 491  
 Müller (H.) 276; 389; 396; 400  
 Munoa (Ph.) 491  
 Muraoka (T.) 25; 66; 72; 75; 77; 80; 258; 316; 360; 418; 491  
 Murphy (C.) 416; 210; 407; 560; 175ss; 177; 191  
 Murphy-O'Connor (J.) 316s  
  
 Naeh (S.) 456  
 Nahman (D.) 491  
 Najman (H.) 271; 317; 491; 268; 597  
 Nam (R.S.) 624  
 Naudé (J.A.) 317  
 Naveh (J.) 44; 74; 82; 400  
 Nebe (G.W.) 354  
 Need (S.) 317  
 Netzer (E.) 491  
 Neugebauer (O.) 377; 400  
 Neusner (J.) 93; 317; 491  
 Newman (J.H.) 317; 491; 597  
 Newsom (C.) 3; 11; 38; 140; 317; 459; 568; 586; 595; 613; 619s  
 Nickelsburg (G.) 44; 45; 270; 317; 382; 383; 388; 400; 563; 635s; 640  
 Nicklas (T.) 317  
 Niclós (J.-V.) 317  
 Nicoletta (J.) 192; 210  
 Niehoff (M.R.) 317  
 Niehr (H.) 491  
  
 Nielse (K.) 41  
 Nielsen (K.) 46; 157  
 Nissan (E.) 492  
 Nissinen (M.) 492  
 Nitzan (B.) 163; 318; 421; 426; 492; 568; 599; 600; 602  
 Noam (Y.) 318; 492  
 Nodet (É.) 318  
 Noegel (S.B.) 360  
 Nordheim (E. von) 519ss; 537ss; 553  
 Norin (S.) 318  
 North (W.) 595  
 Norton (J.) 199s; 210; 199s; 492  
 Novakovic (L.) 318  
 Novick (T.) 318  
 Nunnally (E.) 361; 370  
  
 Oegema (G.S.) 493  
 Oelsner (J.) 376; 379; 400  
 Oesch (J.) 493  
 Öhler (M.) 493  
 Oliver (I.) 493  
 Olson (D.) 493  
 Olsson (B.) 318  
 Omerzu (H.) 493  
 Oppenheim (L.) 84; 378; 400  
 Orlov (A.) 318; 493  
 Ostermann (S.) 318  
 Ottenheim (E.) 318  
  
 Pajunen (M.) 493  
 Palmisano (M.C.) 494  
 Park (H.D.) 318  
 Parker Pearson (P.) 195; 196; 211  
 Parpola (S.) 378; 391; 392; 401  
 Parry (D.) 52; 138; 273; 453; 494; 572; 600  
 Pass (H.L.) 518; 553  
 Passaro (A.) 494  
 Patrich (J.) 211  
 Paul (Sh.) 87; 357; 385; 459; 494; 614  
 Pearce (S.) 318; 374; 396; 401 494  
 Pearson (B.A.) 319  
 Peerbolte (B.J.L.) 319  
 Peleg (Y.) 210; 176; 177; 177; 180; 184; 186; 191; 193; 194; 196; 197; 198; 437; 438; 494

- Penn (W.) 192; 211  
 Pentiuć (E.J.) 319  
 Perdue (G.) 494  
 Perrin (A.) 494  
 Peters (D.M.) 494  
 Petersen (K.) 495  
 Pétigny (A.) 495  
 Petuchowski (J.J.) 253  
 Pfann (S.) 181; 319; 369; 186;  
 193; 211; 495  
 Philonenko (M.) 299; 495  
 Pickup (M.) 319; 495  
 Pilarczyk (K.) 496  
 Pilch (J.J.) 496  
 Pingree (D.) 391  
 Pinnick (A.) 140  
 Piovanelli (P.L.) 319  
 Pitre (B.) 319  
 Plietzsch (S.) 319  
 Ploeg (J. van der) 291  
 Politis (K.D.) 211  
 Pomykala (E.) 496  
 Pope (M.H.) 355  
 Popović (M.) 208; 319; 496  
 Porter (S.) 91; 319; 370; 619  
 Porzig (P.) 496  
 Preucel (R.W.) 179; 210  
 Propp (W.H.C.) 11; 534; 553; 613  
 Puech (É.) 3; 8; 12; 54; 61;  
 85; 137; 195; 196; 199; 211; 287-  
 290; 331; 422; 423; 430; **433-**  
**440**; 436; 458; 496; **515-516**;  
 518; 524; 525; 554; 580; 581;  
 591; 607; 619; **627-649**  
 Pulcinelli (G.) 278  
 Pyysiäinen (L.) 140  
  
 Qafikh (J.) 371  
 Qimron (E.) 52; 117; 126; 132;  
 146; 147; 261; 273; 289; 356;  
 421; 453; 454  
  
 Raabe (P.) 361  
 Rabin (Ch.) 15; 117; 120; 121;  
 122; 126; 406; 497  
 Rabonowitz (I.) 85  
 Rad (G. Von) 43  
 Radermacher (L.) 388  
 Rajak (T.) 497  
 Randall Garr (W.) 66  
  
 Rappaport (U.) 9; 21; 250; 497  
 Ravasco (A.) 497  
 Ravid (L.) 216; 234; 263  
 Redekop (C.W.) 191; 192; 211  
 Reed (A.Y.) 319; 497  
 Regev (E.) **175-213** ; 319; 497  
 Reich (R.) 197ss; 211; 439  
 Reider (J.) 277; 280  
 Reif (S.) 498  
 Reiner (E.) 386ss; 401  
 Reinhartz (A.) 498  
 Reiterer (F.V.) 498  
 Rendsburg (G.) 360; 498  
 Rey (J.-S.) **457-460** ; 498; 556ss;  
 562; 565ss; 568  
 Reymond (E.D.) 360  
 Reynolds (B.E.) 320  
 Riaud (J.) 298  
 Richter (H.-P.) 641  
 Rieman (T.D.) 211; 192  
 Rietz (M.) 166; 320; 607; 613; 616;  
 618s  
 Riska (M.) 499  
 Ritter (E.K.) 380; 387; 401  
 Robinson (P.A.) 197; 211  
 Robson (E.) 375s; 401  
 Rocca (S.) 320  
 Rochberg (F.) 375ss; 401  
 Rodgers (Z.) 320; 499  
 Rofé (A.) 429; 577  
 Röhrer-Ertl (O.) 196; 212  
 Rohrhirsch (F.) 175ss; 212  
 Roitman (A.) 16; 45  
 Röllig (W.) 380; 386; 402  
 Rölver (O.) 320  
 Römer (Th.Ch.) 320  
 Römheld (K.F.D.) 40s  
 Roo (J.C.R. De) 619  
 Rooke (D.W.) 320  
 Rosenblum (J.) 499  
 Rosendal (B.) 157  
 Rosenstiehl (J.-M.) 299  
 Rosenthal (D.) 456  
 Rosen-Zvi (I.) 320  
 Rouwhorst (G.) 320  
 Rowland (Ch.) 499  
 Rubertone (P.E.) 197; 211  
 Rubinstein (A.) 268, 280  
 Ruiz Morell (O.) 456  
 Runia (D.T.) 320



- Ruten (J. Van) 430  
 Ruzer (S.) 499  
 Ryan (S.) 499  
  
 Sacchi (P.) 276ss; 320  
 Sachs (A.) 379; 402  
 Sæbø (M.) 92  
 Safrai (Z.) 212  
 Saley (R.J.) 320; 499  
 Sallaberger (W.) 402  
 Salvesen (A.) 321  
 Sánchez Caro (J.M.) 321  
 Sanders (J.A.) 360; 363; 499; 607ss; 622  
 Sanmartín (J.) 385  
 Saperstein (M.) 499  
 Sarason (R.) 370s; 499  
 Satlow (M.L.) 321; 369  
 Saukkonen (J.) 499; 500  
 Sawyer (J.F.A.) 321  
 Schäfer (P.) 44; 136  
 Schattner-Rieser (U.) 62; 321  
 Schechter (S.) 137; 352; 406  
 Scheper (G.L.) 351  
 Schiffman (L.) 4; 5; 10; 16; 20; 45; 50; 87; 92; 94; **116-133**; 136; 162; 170; 294; 295; 321; 361; 457; 500; 577; 602; 614  
 Schmid (K.) 500  
 Schmidt (F.) 458  
 Schmitt (F.) 297s  
 Schmitz B 500  
 Schniedewind (W.M.) 26s  
 Schofield (A.) 212; 501  
 Schorch (S.) 321  
 Schremer (A.) 321  
 Schuller (E.) 3; 8; 38; **49-59**; 169; 321; 357; 367; 371; 501; 568; 585; 586; 597; 603; 625  
 Schultz (B.) 321; 501; 590  
 Schwartz (S.) 321s; 501s; 14; 236  
 Schwemer (A.M.) 502  
 Schwienhorst-Schönberger (L.) 136  
 Scolnic (B.E.) 502  
 Scott (S.R.) 189; 212; 322; 502  
 Scurlock (J.) 380; 387; 402  
 Segal (M.) 53; 216ss; 219ss; 222; 233; 234; 238; 249; 253; 259; 265; 502; 567; 624  
 Sekki (A.E.) 593  
  
 Seland (T.) 322  
 Sellin (E.) 279  
 Sen (F.) 322; 502  
 Seters (J. Van) 322  
 Seymour (S.) 189; 212  
 Shackel (P.A.) 181; 185; 188; 212  
 Shahar (Y.) 502  
 Shaked (S.) 44; 74  
 Shaker 192  
 Shanks (H.) 179; 212; 502  
 Sharon (N.) **301-328 ; 463-511**  
 Shatzman (I.) 502  
 Shemesh (A.) 322; 441; 447; 449; 502  
 Sheridan (S.G.) 212  
 Shienfenhövel (W.) 213  
 Sidi (N.) 212  
 Siegert (F.) 459  
 Sieker (M.) 62  
 Sievers (J.) 322  
 Sigismund (M.) 322  
 Sigrist (M.) 373  
 Silberstein (N.) 182; 212  
 Silva (M.) 364  
 Sivan (D.) 503  
 Sivertsev (A.) 322  
 Skehan (P.) 42; 609; 621  
 Slater (E.A.) 82  
 Smith (M.) 588  
 Smyth (H.W.) 392; 402  
 Sokoloff (M.) 68; 69; 72; 76; 385; 419; 633; 649  
 Sollamo (R.) 500  
 Souza Nogueira (P. De) 597s  
 Spieckermann (H.) 503  
 Spittler (R.P.) 47  
 Sprinkle (P.) 322  
 Stacey (D.) 322  
 Stadel (C.) 68; 73; 323  
 Stadelmann (H.) 564; 566  
 Stamm (J.J.) 16  
 Starcky (J.) 517; 554  
 Stark (R.) 189; 212  
 Stegemann (H.) 3; 8; 38; 457; 503; 568; 586; 591  
 Stein (D.E.S.) 58  
 Steiner (H.C.) 554  
 Stemberger (G.) 276; 323; 503  
 Stenschke (Ch.) 323  
 Sterling (G.E.) 158; 159; 503  
 Stern (M.) 202

- Steudel (A.) 37; 53; 118; 138; 151; 323; 503; 591  
 Steyn (G.J.) 323  
 Stipp (H.-J.) 503  
 Stoekl (D.) 8; 12  
 Stokes (R.E.) 323  
 Stökl Ben Ezra (D.) 504  
 Stone (M.) 39; 270; 356; 504  
 Strange (J.) 323; 504  
 Stratton (K.) 504  
 Strawn (B.) 137; 166; 323; 364; 370; **607-626**  
 Strobel (A.) 197; 212  
 Stromberg (J.) 504  
 Strugnell (J.) 57; 58; 132; 146; 147; 283; 287; 290; 440; 555; 593  
 Stuckenbruck (L.) 323; 427; 504; 602  
 Stuhlmacher (P.) 273s; 277  
 Sukenik (E.) 281; 457  
 Suter (D.) 323  
 Swanson (D.D.) 324  
 Swart (G.) 504  
 Swerdlow (N.M.) 402  
  
 Tal (I.) 181s; 191; 196; 208; 324; 504  
 Talmon (Sh.) 221; 504; 608ss  
 Talshir (D.) 504s  
 Talshir (Z.) 504s  
 Tamasi (B.) 505  
 Tassin (C.) 324  
 Taylor (J.) 180; 199s; 201; 294; 324  
 Tervanotko (H.) 505  
 Thiessen (M.) 324  
 Thomas (M.) 505  
 Thomas (B.W.) 212  
 Thompson (Th.L.) 159  
 Thureau-Dangin (F.) 381; 402  
 Tiemeyer (L.-S.) 324  
 Tigay (J.H.) 429  
 Tigchelaar (E.J.C.) 12; 37; 89; 90; 137; 156; 158; 160; 287; 289; 291; 324; 359s; 361; 406s; 430; 436; 442; 455; 459; 505; 505; 505; 555; 560; 564; 568; 569; 578; 586; 600; 628  
 Tiller (C.) 210  
 Tiller (P.) 559  
 Tilley (C.) 179; 212  
 Tilly (M.) 505  
 Tolles (F.B.) 212; 192  
 Tomasino (A.J.) 325  
 Tonietti (M.V.) 325  
 Torrey (C.C.) 275  
 Tournay (R.) 278  
 Tov (E.) 10; 19; 20; 52; 80; 142; 150; 162; 335; 285; 287; 325; 331; 334; 336; 338; 352; 353; 355; 362; 363; 365; 366; 367s; 369; 414; 458; 505s; 600; 609; 618; 627  
 Treat (J.) 364  
 Treballe Barrera (J.) 356; 363; 274  
 Trehuedic (K.) 506  
 Tretti (C.) 506  
 Trigger (B.G.) 213; 179  
 Tromp (J.) 506  
 Trompelt (K.) 506  
 Tronier (H.) 506  
 Trstensky (F.) 506  
 Tsfania (L.) 76  
 Tso (M.) 506; 325  
 Tukasi (E.) 507  
 Turkiel (J.) 325  
 Turnage (M.) 507  
 Tzoref (Berrin) (Sh.) 507  
  
 Udoh (F.) 507  
 Ueberschaer (F.) 507  
 Ulfgard (H.) 507  
 Ullinger (J.) 212; 358  
 Ullmann-Margalit 176ss; 213  
 Ulrich (E.) 138; 355; 363; 364; 444; 507; 507; 572; 609; 621; 625  
 Upton (B.G.) 325  
 Urbach (E.E.) 269; 268  
 Urciuoli (E.) **273-281** ; 325  
 Uro (R.) 140  
 Utzschneider (H.) 325  
  
 Vanderkam (J.) 4; 10; 44; 45; 50; 57; 58; 81; 136; 162; 175ss; 213; 218; 221; 223; 236; 255; 257; 258; 259; 269; 325; 355; 357; 457; 507s; 577; 592; 593; 596; 625  
 Vanoni (G.) 402

- Vasholz (R.I.) 69  
 Vaux (R. de) 175ss; 176s; 178;  
 179; 180; 181; 182; 183s; 186;  
 191s; 193; 195; 199; 201; 202;  
 213; 352; 358; 434; 435; 436;  
 439; 457  
 Vazquez Allegue (J.) 508  
 Vegas Montaner (L.) 356  
 Venter (P.M.) 325  
 Venturini (S.) 508  
 Verbeke (E.) **331-349**  
 Vermes (G.) 85; 90; 136; 137;  
 148; 252; 281; 291; 292; 325;  
 356; 459; 508; 600  
 Vianes-Abou Samra (L.) 508  
 Vielhauer (R.) 325  
 Vivian (A.) 25  
 Vogel (M.) 508  
 Voitila (A.) 508  
 Volgger (D.) 325  
  
 Wacholder (B.-Z.) 406; 412; 609;  
 611; 620s; 622  
 Waddell (J.A.) 326  
 Walt (Ch.P. Van Der) 325  
 Wassen (C.) 58; 144; 152; 508  
 Wasser (C.) 357; 50  
 Watson (W.G.E.) 364  
 Waubke (H.-G.) 326  
 Webster (B.) 456; 621  
 Weidner (E.) 392; 402  
 Weigold (M.) 326  
 Weiher (E. von) 376  
 Weis (P.R.) 83  
 Weiss (R.) 73  
 Weiss Halivni (D.) 270  
 Weissenberg (H. von) 326; 509  
 Weitzman (S.) 509  
 Wellmann (B.) 326  
 Werline (R.) 326  
 Werman (C.) 242; 258; 268; 423;  
 509; 574  
 Wernberg Møller (P.) 139; 143;  
 152; 291s; 294  
 Werrett (I.) 326; 509s  
 Wertheimer (S.A.) 371  
 Westenholz (J.) 373  
 Westermann (C.) 55  
 White Crawford (S.) 49; 357; 471  
 Wiessner (P.) 213  
 Wilk (F.) 326  
 Wilker (J.) 510  
 Williamson (H.G.M.) 365  
 Willis 195; 213; 510  
 Wilson (L.) 189; 213; 510; 610;  
 625  
 Winter (M.M.) 326  
 Wintermute (O.S.) 45; 46  
 Wise (M.O.) 76ss; 98; 150; 326;  
 586ss; 597s  
 Witte (M.) 510  
 Wojciechowski (M.) 326  
 Wold (B.) 51; 326; 510; 561; 572  
 Wolff (Ch.) 327  
 Wolfson (E.) 596; 603  
 Wolters (A.M.) 327  
 Wood (B.G.) 197; 213  
 Wooden (R.G.) 327  
 Worrell (J.) 603  
 Wortzman (H.) **463-511**  
 Woude (A.S. van der) 588  
 Wright (B.) 327; 510; 557ss; 582  
 Wright (G.E.) 437  
  
 Xeravits (G.) 135; 327; 510  
  
 Yadin (Y.) 117; 127; 131; 289;  
 455  
 Yardeni (A.) 327; 436  
 Yellin (J.) 175; 185; 213  
 Yentsch (A.) 181; 213  
 Young (I.) 510  
 Yuditsky (A.) 510  
  
 Zahn (M.M.) 327  
 Zanella (F.) 4; **19-34**; 168; 511  
 Zangenberg (J.) 184; 191; 200;  
 208; 176; 213; 327; 358; 437;  
 511  
 Zatelli (I.) 25; 26  
 Zeitlin (S.) 243  
 Zellentin (H.M.) 511  
 Zetterholm (M.) 327  
 Zeuner (F.E.) 213  
 Zewi (T.) 327  
 Zias (J.) 200; 213; 356  
 Ziegler (J.) 275  
 Zimmern (H.) 380; 403  
 Zimmerman (J.) 592  
 Zissi (D.) 201  
 Zissu (B.) 196; 201; 207; 213; 511  
 Zsengellér (J.) 328; 511

# RÉFÉRENCES BIBLIQUES

## ANCIENT TESTAMENT

<i>Genèse</i>		18,1-15	237
1-3	226; 573	18,10	238
1,10	125	21,1	237
1,21	56	21,6	237
2,3	261	22,4	234
2,7	575	22,19	235
2,9	162	27,2	547
3,5	574	29,26-27	264
3,6	162	34	407ss; 415
3,7	581	34,13	252
3,11	459	34,15	406; 413
5,24	570	34,22	406; 413
6,2-4	427	34,23	406; 413
6,7	241	34,27	252
7,2	51	35,12	14
7,11	262	38,24	265
7-8	12	41,8	389
8,4	262	41,24	389
8,14	242	44,5	391
8,20-9,17	241	45,24	388
8,21	241	50,7-14	430
8,21-9,7	242		
9,4	242	<i>Exode</i>	
9,4-6	230	4,22	225
9,8-17	241	6,20	524; 533; 535ss
9,9	241	7,7	535ss
14,20	263	7,11	385; 389
15,7-20	263	7,22	389
15,13	533s	8,3	389
15,18	14	8,14	389
17,1-8	248ss	8,15	284; 389
17,8-9	14	9,9	284
17,21	237	9,11	389

10,12	567	7,27	443
12	235	7,32	30
12,1-27	254	10,11	594
12,6	256	10,19	289
12,8	257	11,32	127
12,11	257	12,1-5	226ss
12,35-36	533	12,4	105
12,40	534; 536	12,5	56
12,43	238	13,8	99
14,8	120	13,29	57
15,14	388	13,59	127
15,20	524	14,31	99
15,21	524	14,32	127
16,5	124	15,26	105
16,6	533	17,10	241
16,18	284	17,11-14	242
16,29	124	18,12	526
19,5	222; 237; 288	18,19	105
19,6	236; 237	18,21	252ss
19,10	126	19,17	121
20,12	557	19,19	444ss
20,23	228	19,26	242; 391
21,29	57	20,2-5	252
22,15-16	449	20,19	526
22,17	389	21,5	450
24,8	243	21,7	450s
24,10	102	21,14-15	450s
27,7	284	21,18	268
28,3	156	22,12	30
29,27	30	23,15-21	242; 245
29,38-42	244; 262	23,32	233
30,14	29	23,40	237; 239; 240ss
30,15	15	23,43	238
30,32	446	24,19-20	262
32,16	285; 290	25,29	123
33	87	27,28	122
33,1	14	27,29	122
34,22	245	27,30-33	263
36,1	119		
36,3	119	<i>Nombres</i>	
38,7	284	1,17	285
		5,9	30
<i>Lévitique</i>		8,5	284
1,5	289	8,21	99
3,17	241	9,2-3	254
4,12	194	9,3	256
4,14	289	9,5	256
4,18	284	9,9-13	254
6,21	194	12,1	524
7,14	30	12,4	524

12,5	524	12,6.11.17	30
12,10	524	12,11	29
13,20	127	12,15-16	242
15,19	29	12,16	241
15,20	30	12,17	29
15,21	29	12,20-26	242
15,30	120	12,23-25	241
17,4	289	13,7	57
18,2	138	13,15	444
18,4	138	14,1	450
18,11	30	14,2	288
18,19	30	14,22-29	264
18,20	563	14,23	264
18,21-32	263	16,7	257
18,24	30	16,9-11	242; 245
18,26	29	16,10	245
18,28	29	16,14	237
19,9	127	16,16	245
19,19	29	17,8-12	93
20,15	13	17,17	52
21,9	237	18,10	252; 391
22,22.32	48	18,11	384
22,22-35	43; 47	22,10-11	445
28,2	254	22,13-21	58
28,3-8	244; 262	22,20-21	449
28,26	245	22,22	448
29,12-40	238	22,23-29	448
29,35	265	23,10	427
31,23	127	23,12-14	106
31,29	29	24,1	449
31,41	29	24,6	562
31,52	30	24,22-29	263
33,3	120	27,24	262
34,17	290	28,54	57
35,2-5	124	28,65	388
35,4-5	125	28,69-30,20	429
45,13	29	29,19	5
48,8	29	29,28	130
48,9	29	30,19	429
48,20	29	31,21	259
		31,29	547
		32,7	258
		32,9	237
		33,1	547
		33,2	409
		33,10	594
		33,12	597
<i>Deutéronome</i>		<i>Josué</i>	
2,25	388	1,1	547
5,12	126	24,32	430
5,16	557; 567		
6,5	129		
7,6	261; 288		
7,8	14		
9,5	14		
12,6	29		

<i>Juges</i>		28,8	290
1,1	547	29,3	288
3,7-10	363		
12,6	444		
16,4-21	460		
		<i>2 Chroniques</i>	
		13,22	92
		19,7	118
<i>Ruth</i>		20,33	572
4,7	260s	24,27	92
		28,15	285
<i>1 Samuel</i>		30,19	105
1,16	17	31,19	285
11	460	33,6	389
16,12-23	617	35,13	257
25,26	122		
		<i>Esdras</i>	
<i>2 Samuel</i>		4,11	527
4,2	437	8,20	285
19,1	388	8,35	289
22,24	616ss		
22,26	616ss	<i>Néhémie</i>	
22,33	616ss; 620	10,1	118
23,1-7	616	10,37-38	263
		12,44	263
<i>1 Rois</i>			
1,50	284	<i>Esther</i>	
1,51	284	3,12-22	533
2,28	284	3,14	299; 527
5,18	38ss	4,8	527
8,2	239	8,13	527
8,65	239		
12,32	239	<i>1 Maccabées</i>	
20,18	46	1,11	250
		1,33-36	42
<i>2 Rois</i>		2,41	298
9,22	389	2,42	623
12,6-17	407s	7,12-17	623
12,9	406; 408; 411		
16,10	284	<i>2 Maccabées</i>	
17,17	391	14,6	623
21,6	391		
23,10	252	<i>Cantique des Cantiques</i>	
24,18-25,30	460s	1,1	356
		2,1	356
<i>1 Chroniques</i>		2,9-5,1	353
11,39	437	4,1-6	359
12,31	285	4,1-7	361ss
16,9	292	4,8	356
16,41	285	4,8-5,16	358
21,1	43ss	4,8-6,10	354ss
23,28	105	4,16	356



5,2-4	360	8,1-3	430
6,1-10	358	11,9-11	148
6,12	356	11,15	284; 288
7,1	356	16,16	453ss
7,1-7	359; 361ss	17,1	285
6,11-7,7	353	17,9	285
		17,21	125
<i>Isaïe</i>		25,11	80
1,1	530	31,32	13
3,3	385	32,35	252
8,2	120	33,8	99
8,14	289	34,13	13
8,16	258; 260	42,5	120
8,20	258	52	460s
11,9	157		
19,8	453ss	<i>Lamentations</i>	
26,14.19	458	3,59	156
28,15	118		
28,29	383	<i>Ézéchiël</i>	
29,11	529	7,10	94
34,15	51	4,6	43
40,3	89	10,7	119
41,8	279	11,16	289
41,27	454	12,18	388
42,1	279	21,19	129
43,10	279	21,22	129
44,1	279	28,15	618
44,1-2	290	36,17	105
44,2	279	36,21-25	99
44,21	279	36,25	99
45,4	279	36,29	99
47,9	389; 640	37,23	99
47,9-14	159	40,43	124
47,10	390	40,46	284
47,12	385; 389; 640	43,13	284
47,13	394	44	144
48,20	279	44,15	138; 142; 148
49,2	599	44,30	30
49,3	279	45,6.7	30
52,5	275	45,25	239
52,14	273ss	47,10	453
53,1	275	48,10.18	30
53,1-2	278	48,12	30
53,5	119		
57,8	360	<i>Daniel</i>	
57,14	284	1,20	389
58,13	126	2,1-3	424
		2,2	389
<i>Jérémie</i>		2,10	389
1,1	528; 530	2,19	86
6,21	284		

2,27	388; 389	3,9	333; 336; 338; 340;
2,28	556		341; 342; 347; 348;
3,6	635		349
3,7	635	3,10	333; 334; 335; 336;
3,13	388		340; 341; 342; 343;
3,15	635		344; 346; 347; 348
3,25	385	4,1	336; 338; 346
4,4	389	4,2	333; 334; 335; 336;
4,6	86; 389		338; 343; 344; 345;
4,30	635		348
5	85	4,5	341; 343
5,5	635		
5,6	385	<i>Osée</i>	
5,11	389	10,11	28
5,12	385		
5,15	388	<i>Amos</i>	
6,3-5	130	1,1	527
9,2	80	3,14	284
10,21	577	6,1	285
12,1-3	458		
<i>Joël</i>		<i>Abdias</i>	
1,1	530	1,1	529
1,6	336		
1,14	335; 342	<i>Michée</i>	
1,15	336; 338	1,1	334; 335; 338; 339;
1,16	336; 337; 339		341; 342
2,1	334; 335; 336; 338;	1,2	334; 336; 340; 341;
	347		347; 348
2,2	348	1,3	336; 339
2,3	345	1,4	334; 336; 339; 341;
2,4	335; 336; 341; 342;		342; 347
	343; 347; 348; 349	1,5	336; 337; 338; 339;
2,5	333; 335; 336; 342;		344; 347; 349
	343; 345; 348;	1,6	335; 336; 338; 340;
2,6	333; 337; 342; 343;		342; 343; 346; 347;
	346; 347; 348		348
2,7	334; 335; 336; 339;	1,7	334; 336; 339; 340;
	340; 348		341; 343; 344; 346;
2,8	348		347; 348
3,2	333; 336; 345; 348	1,8	343; 347; 349
3,3	335; 336; 336; 338;	2,7	336; 338; 343
	339; 340; 342; 347	2,8	333; 334; 336; 341;
3,4	333; 333; 334; 334;		344; 345; 347; 348
	336; 340	3,3	340
3,5	333; 345	3,5	338; 341; 348
3,7	336; 340; 341; 347	3,6	334; 336; 338; 340;
3,8	333; 334; 336; 338;		343; 347; 348
	340; 340; 341; 346;	4,3	333; 334; 335; 336;
	347; 348		338; 340; 341; 342;
			343; 346; 348

4,4	333; 335; 336; 338; 339; 344; 345; 347; 348	3,7	334; 340; 342; 347; 348
4,5	333; 336; 339; 340; 343; 348	3,8	334; 336; 337; 338; 339; 341
4,6	333; 334; 342; 346	3,9	336; 340; 341; 344; 348
4,7	334; 335; 336; 340; 343; 344; 345; 346; 347; 348	3,10	335; 338; 339; 340; 346; 347; 348
4,8	334; 335; 339; 341; 344	3,11	334; 335; 347; 348
4,9	336; 337; 338; 339; 341; 348	3,12	333; 334; 339; 342; 344
4,10	335; 345	3,13	334; 334; 335; 344
5,1	333; 334; 336; 338; 339; 341; 342; 345	3,14	338; 341; 346; 348
5,2	336; 338; 342; 343; 347; 348	3,15	333; 338; 339; 340; 348
5,3	333; 334; 335; 336; 339; 343; 344; 346; 347; 348	3,16	336; 339; 343; 346
5,4	333; 334; 336; 339; 342; 343; 345; 346; 347	3,17	335
5,5	333; 334; 335; 336; 338; 339; 342; 344; 346; 348	<i>Habacuc</i>	
5,6	338; 339; 344; 347	1,5	338; 339; 340; 343; 344; 347; 349
5,11	389	1,6	335; 336; 339; 340; 341; 342; 348
<i>Nahum</i>		1,7	333; 342; 348
1,1	529	1,8	333; 336; 337; 339; 342; 343; 344; 345; 348
1,13	342	1,9	334; 337; 339; 340; 344; 345; 347; 348
1,14	333; 334; 337; 340; 341	1,10	336; 339; 340; 341; 342; 344; 345; 346; 348
2,5	346	1,11	336; 337; 343; 346
2,6	334; 336; 337; 339; 340; 343; 348; 349	1,14	338; 342
2,7	336; 341; 342; 344; 347	1,15	333; 335; 336; 338; 341; 343; 346; 348
2,8	333; 335; 336; 338; 339; 342; 345; 348	1,16	334; 335; 336; 337; 338; 339; 340; 341; 343; 345; 347; 348
2,9	335; 341; 342; 344; 348	1,17	335; 336; 338; 340; 343; 346; 348
2,10	334; 334; 336; 337	2,1	334; 336; 339; 341; 344; 345; 346; 347; 348; 349
2,13	341	2,2	334; 337; 340; 344; 345; 346; 348
2,14	334; 340; 342; 348	2,3	333; 334; 337; 339; 340; 341; 343; 344; 348
3,3	336; 338; 344; 346		
3,6	336; 346		

2,4	333; 334; 336; 337; 339; 342; 345; 348; 459	1,3 1,4	337; 342; 347 334; 337; 338; 339; 340; 341; 343; 346; 347; 348; 349
2,5	335; 335; 337; 338; 339; 340; 341; 342; 343; 345; 346; 346; 348	1,5 1,6 1,10	334; 337; 343; 347 333 455
2,6	333; 336; 337; 339; 340; 341; 342; 343; 346; 348; 349	1,13 1,14	337; 338; 340; 342; 348 335; 337; 341; 345
2,7	336; 337; 339; 340; 342; 344; 345; 348	1,15	333; 337; 338; 341; 343; 344; 345; 349
2,8	335; 337; 339; 346; 347	1,16	334; 335; 338; 343; 344; 347
2,13	335; 345; 346	1,17	336; 337; 339; 340; 345; 348
2,14	338; 339; 341		
2,15	341; 342; 343; 346; 347; 348	1,18	334; 335; 337; 343; 348
2,16	335; 337; 339; 341; 342; 343; 345; 346; 347; 348	2,9 2,10	337; 339; 342; 343; 348 339; 343; 348
2,17	333; 334; 335; 337; 338; 339; 340; 343; 345; 347; 348	3,6 3,7	333; 334; 339; 345 333; 334; 339; 340; 341; 343; 347; 348
2,18	333; 334; 338; 339; 341; 343; 344; 347; 348; 349	<i>Zacharie</i> 1,1	334; 343; 530
2,19	333; 334; 335; 336; 337; 339; 340; 343; 344; 345; 3 4 6 ; 348; 348	1,2 1,3 1,4	345 333; 345; 347; 348; 349 333; 334; 336; 339; 342; 345; 346; 347; 348; 349
2,20	333; 334; 336; 337; 339; 341; 344; 345; 348	1,12	343; 347
3,9	333; 334; 341; 342; 343; 346	1,13 1,14	338 333; 345
3,10	336; 337; 341; 342; 346; 347; 348	1,19 2,2	349 337; 339
3,11	335; 336; 342	2,3	333
3,12	334; 335; 337	2,4	346
3,13	334; 338; 341; 343; 345; 346; 348	2,7 2,8	333; 335; 341 333; 344; 346
3,14	333; 334; 340; 341; 342; 343; 344; 346; 348	2,9 2,11 2,12	340; 342 335 333; 339; 347
3,15	336	2,16 2,17	334 335; 341; 343
<i>Sophonie</i>		3,1	337; 338; 346; 348
1,1	333; 334; 530	3,1-2	43
1,2	333; 333; 344	3,2	333; 335; 337

3,4	284; 288; 333; 337; 341; 343; 348	<i>Psaumes</i> 1,1	90; 91
3,5	334; 337; 338; 341; 343; 345; 346; 348	4,5 16,4	388 289
3,6	341; 343	18,24	616ss
3,7	333; 334; 335; 336; 337; 339; 340; 342; 345; 347; 348	18,26 18,33 45,8	616ss 616ss 277
4,9	334; 337; 347; 349	58,6	384
8,19	333; 334; 337; 345; 346; 347	69,13 86,16	292 57
8,2	334; 337; 343; 345; 346	91 101,2	599 618
8,21	333; 336; 339	101,6	618
8,23	333; 335; 336; 337; 338; 339; 343; 344; 347; 349	105,2 109,6 109,20	292 41; 47 41
9,1	334; 335; 337; 339; 341; 342; 343; 347	109,29 116,16	41 57
9,2	335; 337; 338; 340; 345; 348	118,2 118,20	289 284; 285; 286; 289
9,3	334; 337; 338; 340; 341; 344; 345	118,27 119,1	239; 284; 285; 289 618
9,4	333; 334; 336; 337; 338; 339; 342; 348	119,23 119,27 119,48	292 292 292
9,5	337; 346	119,78	292
13,2	106	119,133 119,148	39ss 292
<i>Malachie</i>		135,4	288
2,7	594	135,12	290
3,16	568	142,5	292
3,17	288		
<i>Job</i>		<i>Proverbes</i> 2,18-19	157
1-2	46; 47s	3,21	383
1,6-9	43	5,5	157
1,12	43	7	357
2,1-4	43	10,29	618
2,6-7	43	11,5	618
3,17	388	11,15	562
7,11	292	11,20	618
12,6	388	16,31	578
14,1	57; 388	17,18	562
15,14	57	20,13	566
25,4	57	20,16	562
26,3	383	21,5	561
37,24	156	21,31	124
38,24	388	23,22	567
40,31	455	24,17-18	566
41,9	51	29,9	388

<i>Ecclésiaste (Qohelet)</i>		8,18	159
2,8	288	10,18	57
3,11	581	12,11	160
3,20	581	21,27	42
8,1	84	38,14	84
21,27	43	43,10	292
		45,4	593
<i>Ecclésiastique (Ben Sira)</i>		50,1-21	593
<i>Ensemble</i>	555-583	51,13-30	359; 608
3,22	130	51,21-22	360

## NOUVEAU TESTAMENT

<i>Luc</i>		<i>Apocalypse</i>	
12,13-21	563	1,4	299
		1,8	299
<i>Jean</i>		4,8	299
1,4	299	9,13	284
1,4-9	10	11,17	299
8,1-35	10	16,5	299
<i>1 Pierre</i>			
2,24-25	119		

## RÉFÉRENCES AUX TEXTES DE QUMRAN<sup>(1)</sup>

<b>1QIsa<sup>a</sup></b>		II,2	619
XV,11	453ss	II,5-10	426
XXXV,7	454	II,12	284
		II,15-16	5
<b>1Q22</b>		II,17	284
1 i 3	85	III-IV	421ss
		III,2	603
<b>1Q26</b>		III,4-5	98
<i>Ensemble</i>	555-583	III,9-10	619s
1 4	158	III,13-IV,26	569ss
3 2	160	III,15	299
		III,15-17	424
<b>1QpHab</b> ( <i>1Qpesher Habacuc</i> )		III,19	11
II,8	85	III,23	221
XII,10	16	IV,6	157
XII,8-9	286; 451	IV,9-10	357
		IV,15	290
<b>1Q20</b>		IV,21	99
<b>(1QapGen</b> <i>Apocryphe de la Genèse</i> )		IV,22	619
XX,2-8	360ss	IV,23	11
XXXI,1	629	IV,24	12; 156
		IV,26	290; 603
<b>1Q27</b> ( <i>1QLivre des Mystères</i> )		V	139
1 i 2-8	159	V,1	91; 136
1 i 7	157	V,2	148ss; 604
		V,7	131
<b>1QS</b> ( <i>Règle de la Communauté</i> )		V,9	148ss; 150; 604
I,6	357	V,12	120; 130
I,16-II,32	204	V,13	416

(1) La classification des textes qumrâniens suit l'ordre établi dans la « List of the Manuscripts from Qumran » dans F GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated The Qumran Texts in English Second Edition* Brill/Eerdmans, Leiden/Grand Rapids 1994.



V,14	417
V,18-20	416
V,21-22	149
VI,2-3	294
VI,3-6	295
VI,4	131; 294
VI,4-5	204
VI,6-8	92
VI,7	294s
VI,16-17	416
VI,20	129
VI,24	89; 91
VI,25-VII,19	205
VI,27	122
VII,8	121
VII,9-18	293s
VII,13	296; 360
VII,15	291ss
VII,20	129
VII,24	405ss
VII,24-25	415s
VIII,10	619
VIII,10-13	204
VIII,12-16	94; 458
VIII,14-16	91
VIII,15	89ss
VIII,18	619
VIII,21	619
VIII,23	407
VIII,23-24	415s
VIII,24	131
VIII,26	89; 91
VIII,34	405ss
IX,2	619
IX,3-5	204
IX,4	32
IX,4-5	204
IX,5	619
IX,7	149
IX,9	619
IX,13	130; 131
IX,14	148ss
IX,18	157
X,1-3	298
X,6	32
X,6.14	32
X,10	298
X,21	53
XI,3-4	556

XI,5	157
XI,8	601; 603
XI,14	99
XI,16	57
XI,21	57

**1Q28a***(IQSa 1QRègle de la Congrégation)*

I,2	150; 604
I,4	52; 455
I,7	577
I,10	52
I,11	122; 128; 169; 202
I,14	128
I,15-16	150
I,23	150
I,24	604
I,24-25	150
I,26	603
I,28	59; 619
II,13	150
II,16-17	295
II,17	294
II,17-22	204
II,3	150; 604

**1Q28b***(IQSb Recueil des Bénédictiones)*

I,8	38
III,22	150
III,27	595
III,28	594
IV	602ss
IV,26	594
V,22	619s

**1QM (Règle de la Guerre)**

I	421
IV,1	32
V-IX	590
VII,2	99
VII,3	52
VII,4-7	357
VII,6-7	106
XI,9	16
XII,2-3	285
XIII,2	17
XIII,5	105
XIII,7	13

XIII,9-10	603	<b>4Q107</b>	
XIII,11	221	<i>Ensemble</i>	351-371
XIII,12	11		
XIV,7	11; 619	<b>4Q108</b>	
XVII,8	11	<i>Ensemble</i>	351-371
<b>1QH<sup>a</sup></b> ( <i>1QHodayot 1QHymnes</i> )		<b>4Q109</b>	
I,2	455	<i>Ensemble</i>	365
I,28	59		
II,8	119	<b>4Q158</b> ( <i>4QRP<sup>a</sup></i> )	
IV,6	38	10-12 12	121
V,15	568		
V,20	156	<b>4Q159</b>	
VIII,21	99	1 ii 1	290
VIII,36	57	2-4 8	58
IX,13	157	2-4 9	58
IX,21	157	5	87
IX,23	568	ii 4-8	448
IX,25-26	568		
IX,36	619	<b>4Q163</b>	
IX,38	11	22 3	151
X,13	157		
XI,29,33	17	<b>4Q166</b> ( <i>4QpHos<sup>a</sup></i> )	
XII,15	284	2 16	118
XII,37	99		
XIII,16	98; 102	<b>4Q171</b> ( <i>4QpPs<sup>a</sup></i> )	
XIII,24	16; 17	1-2 ii 9	16
XIV,8	99	1-4 iii 10	16
XIV,32	11	1-10 iv 15	120
XIV,32-33	569		
XV,27	157	<b>4Q173</b>	
XVI,6	157	<i>Ensemble</i>	283ss; 287-290
XVI,11	157		
XVII,23	157	<b>4Q174</b> ( <i>4QFlorilegium</i> )	
XVIII,29-30	568	1-2 i 17	151
XIX,10	99; 157	1-21 21 4	123
XIX,30	99	4,3	17
XX,13	157		
XX,20	157	<b>4Q177</b> ( <i>4QCatena<sup>a</sup></i> )	
XXV,31	598	9 7	119
XXV,34-		12-13 i	421
XXVII,3	586ss		
XLV,3	383	<b>4Q178</b>	
		7 1	52
<b>4Q14</b>		<b>4Q179</b>	
<i>Ensemble</i>	365	1 10	53
<b>4Q106</b>		2 6	53
<i>Ensemble</i>	351-371	2 7	57

**4Q180**

1 i 86

1 7 86

**4Q181**

1 ii 5 603

**4Q201**

1 ii 14 54

1 iii 15 383

1 iii 8 384

1 iv 382; 396

1 iv 1 383

1 iv 2 389

1 iv 2-4 384

1 iv 3 392

1 iv 5 54

1 vi 396

1a-b 628-630

1c i + d 630-633

1c ii + e(+r+

s+q) + 4 + 5 633-639

1f + j + g + h 639-644

1l 648

1m 647

1o 647s

1p 647

3 648

8 648

8a 648

1l 646s

**4Q202**

1 i 25-26 639

1 ii 18 54

1 ii 19 383; 389ss; 640

1 ii 25a 637

1 iii 382; 396

1 iii 2 383; 385

1 iii 4 380; 384

1 iv 2 383

**4Q203** (*4QEn<sup>a</sup>*)

3 3 390

8 7 51; 54

8 8 54

**4Q204** (*4QEn<sup>c</sup>*)

1 ii 26 392

1 vi 20 391

5 i 27 54

**4Q206**

4 ii 1 424

**4Q209**

23 2 530

25 3-4 530

26 6 531

**4Q210** (*4QEnastr<sup>c</sup>*)

1 ii 18 635

**4Q213** (*4QTestLev<sup>a</sup>*)

3-4 3 51

4 1-6 11

**4Q214**

3 3 54

**4Q216**

I,11-12 298

I,9-13 259

II,4-5 259

IV,3-5 259

VII,16-17 261

**4Q217**

2 259

2 1 298

**4Q223-224**

2 ii 8 57

**4Q225**

2 i 9 17s

2 i 9 46

2 ii 6-7.13 46

2 ii 13-14 17s

2 i 22 41

**4Q228**

1 i 1 298

1 i 4 298

1 i 7 298

**4Q234***Ensemble* 438**4Q246**

1 i 14 52

<b>4Q249</b>			<b>CD</b> ( <i>Document de Damas; Zadokite</i>
1i-3 8a	52		<i>Fragments; Cairo Damascus Cove-</i>
			<i>nant</i> )
<b>4Q251</b>			I,1 59
1-2 5	124		I,7 139
10,9	31		II,2-5 11
			II,2-III,12 15
<b>4Q252</b> ( <i>4QBenPatr; 4QpGen<sup>a</sup></i> )			II,7 424
V,5	12		II,13 285
			II,15-16 619s
<b>4Q254</b>			II,16 357
4,4	12		II,17 120
			III,1 120
<b>4Q256</b> ( <i>4QS<sup>b</sup></i> )			III,4 120
I,1	91		III,12-16 458
IX	137		III,14 130
IX,1	90		III,20-IV,5 142ss
IX,3	149		IV 138ss
IX,7-8	149		IV,4-5 285
XIX,4	32		IV,13.18 17
			IV,15-18 357
<b>4Q257</b> ( <i>4QS<sup>c</sup></i> )			V 169
III,3	603		V,2 52
			V,6-7 286
<b>4Q258</b> ( <i>4QS<sup>d</sup></i> )			V,9-10 56
I	137		V,11 103; 130
I,1	90s		V,18 17
I,2	149		VI-VII 413
II,1-2	149		VI,2 139
VII,1-3	90		VI,17 101
VII,5	32		VI,18 118
VII,7	149		VI,19 128
			VI,21 16
<b>4Q259</b> ( <i>4QS<sup>e</sup></i> )			VII,20 130
I,15	291		VIII,8 15
III,6	89		VIII,14-18 13
III,10	148ss		VIII,18 15
			IX,1 122
<b>4Q261</b> ( <i>4QS<sup>f</sup></i> )			IX,1-2 130
1a-b 1-2	149		IX,2 455
			IX,3 121; 128
<b>4Q264</b> ( <i>4QS<sup>g</sup></i> )			IX,4-5 122
8	53; 57		IX,6 121
			IX,8-9 122
<b>4Q264A</b>			IX,10 122
1 6-7	412		IX,11 121; 129
			IX,12 122
<b>4Q265</b>			IX,13 120; 121
4 ii 5	119		IX,14 120
7 16	56		IX,15 121

IX,16	121; 129	XIII,4-7	147
IX,17	131	XIII,5	127
IX,18	122	XIII,6	119
IX,19	123	XIII,7	103
IX,20	129	XIII,12	424
IX,21	100; 120	XIII,13-14	443
IX,22-23	58	XIII,14	119
IX,23	100; 120	XIII,15	122
X,2	120; 128; 131	XIV,8	577
X,3	120; 129	XIV,9	139
X,3-4	123	XIV,14	16
X,4	130	XV,3-4	123
X,6	577	XV,6	130
X,7	128	XV,13	129
X,10	126	XVI,2-4	221; 269
X,11	126	XVI,3-4	258; 298
X,12	127	XVI,5	17; 221
X,13	126	XIX,11	139
X,14	127; 129	XIX,22	122
X,14-15	125	XIX,26-31	13
X,18-20	412	XIX,30	14
X,21	124; 125	XX	413; 416
X,22-XI,9	269	XX,1	139
XI,2	123; 126	XX,6	89
XI,3	125	XX,7	405 <sup>ss</sup>
XI,4	118	XX,12	118
XI,7-8	123; 124	XX,17	11
XI,9	125	XX,26	91
XI,10-11	125		
XI,15	122; 124	<b>4Q266</b> (4QD <sup>a</sup> )	
XI,16	125	2 1	619
XI,17	122; 124	2 4	619
XI,20	126	2 i 11	139
XI,22	118; 126	2 iii 24	285
XI,23	119	3 ii 24	118
XII,1-2	127	5 i	141 <sup>ss</sup>
XII,2	127	5 ii	145
XII,3	129	5 ii 3	121
XII,4	124	5 ii 4	119
XII,5	119	5 ii 6	104; 124
XII,8	131	6 i 13	147
XII,11	128	9 i 2	125
XII,12	127	9 ii 3	126
XII,16	126	10 i 12	139
XII,17	124	10 ii 14	291
XII,18	127	11	416
XII,23	124; 139	11 14-15	412
XIII,2	577	11,15	405 <sup>ss</sup> ; 414
XIII,4	125	11 18-20	89

<b>4Q267</b> ( <i>4QD<sup>b</sup></i> )		1 i 8	103
2 8	139	2	145
5 ii	141ss	3 ii 4	101; 105
5 iii 1-8	145		
9 I 6	121	<b>4Q276</b>	
		9 i 7	120
<b>4Q268</b> ( <i>4QD<sup>c</sup></i> )		<b>4Q277</b>	
1 14	139	1 ii 5	104
		1 ii 11	103
<b>4Q269</b> ( <i>4QD<sup>d</sup></i> )		<b>4Q280</b>	
9 7	58	<i>Ensemble</i>	421; 426s
11 i 2	139		
<b>4Q270</b> ( <i>4QD<sup>e</sup></i> )		<b>4Q284</b>	
2 ii 6	144	1 7	127
2 ii 11	103	3 iv	105
2 iii 16	56		
3 iii 20	100	<b>4Q284a</b>	
5 21	58	1 3	129
6 ii 17	298	1 5	129
6 ii 18	17		
6 iii 16	122	<b>4Q286</b> ( <i>4QBer<sup>a</sup></i> )	
6 iv 20	126	7 ii 1-2	17
6 iv 21	99	7 ii 2	17
6 v	269	7 ii 4	104
6 v 4	412		
7 i 5	291	<b>4Q298</b>	
7 ii 12-15	89	<i>Ensemble</i>	369
<b>4Q271</b> ( <i>4QD<sup>f</sup></i> )		<b>4Q299</b> ( <i>4QMyst<sup>a</sup></i> )	
<i>Ensemble</i>	441ss	60 3	288
2 8-10	100		
3	169	<b>4Q300</b> ( <i>4QMyst<sup>b</sup></i> )	
3 14	58; 120	3	159
3 1-15	54		
3 7-15	444	<b>4Q317</b>	
3 9-10	444	1+1a ii 11	298
4 ii 4-5	298	2 30	298
4 ii 6	17	4 33	298
4 7-15	442ss	9 13	298
5 i	269		
5 i 9	118	<b>4Q341</b>	
5 i 15	126	<i>Ensemble</i>	438
5 i 20	119		
<b>4Q272</b>		<b>4Q365</b>	
1 ii 2	147	15a-b 7	104
<b>4Q273</b>		<b>4Q367</b>	
1 i 5	416	1a-b 10	289

**4Q372**

3 6 298

**4Q378**

3 i 1 104

**4Q379**

1 2 597

**4Q381**

15 2 57

46a+b 5 99

69 ii 105

76-77 5 288

**4Q387**

2 ii 3 284

2 iii 4 18

**4Q390**

1 11 18

2 i 7 18

**4Q394** (*4QMMT<sup>a</sup>*)

3-7 i 19 101

8 iv 4 105

8 iv 7 101

**4Q396** (*4QMMT<sup>c</sup>*)*Ensemble* 441ss

1-2 ii 6 101

1-2 iii 5 101

1-2 iii 8 101; 105

1-2 iv 10 104

IV,4-11 442ss

IV 10 449

**4Q398** (*4QMMT<sup>c</sup>*)

5 4 52

**4Q400** (*4QShirShab<sup>a</sup>*)

1 i 4 459

1 i 6 11; 601

1 i 15 99

1 i 16 11; 459

1 i 17 595

2 6 599

2 7 32

3 i 2 102

**4Q403** (*4QShirShab<sup>d</sup>*)

1 1 619

1 22 619

1 i 19 102

1 i 22 11

1 i 40-41 601

1 i 42 101

1 ii 26 32

**4Q404** (*4QShirShab<sup>e</sup>*)

2 3 11; 619

**4Q405** (*4QShirShab<sup>f</sup>*)

13 3 102

13 6 11; 619

23 ii 12 32

**4Q414**

13 7-9 99

27-28 i 3 101

**4Q415-418***Ensemble* 555-583**4Q415**

2 ii 9 458

11 11 458

**4Q416**

1 10 11

2 159

2 ii 160

2 ii 3-4 156

2 ii 7-10 158

2 ii 10-21 161

2 ii 14-17 161

2 ii 14-21 162

2 ii 20 455

2 ii 21 56; 58

2 iii 6-8 163

2 iii 8-12 16

2 iii 9 458

2 iii 18 158

2 iii 20 53; 458

2 iv 5 53; 57

2 iv 13 53; 57

**4Q417**

1 3-5 299



1 i 2	158; 161	<b>4Q455</b>	
1 i 4	158	2	118
1 i 6-7	156		
1 i 8-9	51	<b>4Q471b + 4Q431</b>	
1 i 13	158	Ensemble 586ss	
1 i 25	162		
2 i 11	458	<b>4Q482</b>	
2 ii	156; 161	1 4	57
<b>4Q418</b>		<b>4Q491 (4QM<sup>a</sup>)</b>	
8	156; 161	1-3 6	52
9+9a-c 8	458	8-10 1-5	619
10ab 3	458	11 i	585ss
10 1	158	11 i 11	16
11	161	14-21 4	52
43-44-45 2-3	299		
43-45	156	<b>4Q501</b>	
69 ii 4-9	156	5	53
69 ii 12-15	163		
81	160; 593	<b>4Q502</b>	
81 4-5	596	<i>Ensemble</i>	369
81 12	595	1 3	53
123 ii 4	158	1-3 6	59
126 ii 6-10	163	34 3	53
172 4	619	309 1	52; 53
172 5	12		
184 2	158	<b>4Q504 (4QDibHam<sup>a</sup>)</b>	
219 2	158	1-2 iv 12s	38s
		1-2 iv 12-14	46
<b>4Q423</b>		<b>4Q506</b>	
<i>Ensemble</i>	555-583	131-132 3	52
1-2 1-2	161		
5	155	<b>4Q510 (4QShir<sup>a</sup>)</b>	
5 5	162	1 9	619
<b>4Q427</b>		<b>4Q511 (4QShir<sup>b</sup>)</b>	
7	586ss	2 i 6	601
		8	599ss
<b>4Q429</b>		10 8	619
1 ii 3	98; 102	18 ii 7-8	599
		20 i 1	99
<b>4Q430</b>		35	599ss
3	284	52-59 2	102
		63-63 ii 4	32
<b>4Q444</b>		<b>4Q512</b>	
1-4i+5 viii	104	29-32 9	99
		39 ii 2	99
<b>4Q446</b>			
1,5	16		

40-41 i 4	101
40-41 2	53; 57
42-44 ii 5	99
40-41 v	105

**4Q513**

2 ii 1	105
2 ii 3	32

**4Q514**

1 i 1 52	
1 i 7	98

**4Q524**

6-13 9	31
--------	----

**4Q525**

11-12 3	619s
23 9	284

**4Q529**

1 2	73
1 4	73

**4Q530** (*4QGiants<sup>b</sup>*)

2 ii + 6-12 2	390
2ii + 6-12 6	424
2 ii + 6-12 14	85
7 ii 7	85

**4Q531**

22 12	390
-------	-----

**4Q537**

12 1	100
------	-----

**4Q541**

9 1	628
9 3-4	594
10 3	635

**4Q542** (*4QTestQahat*)

<i>Ensemble</i>	518ss
1 ii 6	73
1 ii 9-13	434; 531

**4Q543-548**

<i>Ensemble</i>	423ss
-----------------	-------

**4Q543-549**

<i>Ensemble</i>	518ss
-----------------	-------

**4Q543**

<i>Ensemble</i>	517-544
1	524ss
5-10	529
6 5	72
14	529

**4Q544**

1-3	529
1 1	73
1 6	537

**4Q545**

1a i	524ss
1a i 11	531
1a i 14-19	531ss
4	529
4 i 15-19	531

**4Q546**

1	524ss
7-12	529
14	532

**4Q547** 3 1

3 5,6	385
8	384s
9-17	532
9 6-7	529
9 8	532
9 8	527

**4Q548**

1 ii 2 11.16	10
--------------	----

**4Q550** (*4QprotEsther<sup>a-f</sup>*)

<i>Ensemble</i>	635
-----------------	-----

**4Q552**

1 i + 27	635
----------	-----

**4Q553**

3 1	640
-----	-----

**4Q556**

1 3	629
3 5	640

**4Q558**

40 2	629
------	-----

**4Q559**

3 8	73
-----	----

<b>4Q561</b>	
3 10	101
<b>4Q570</b>	
9 2	54
<b>4Q586</b>	
1 2	51
2	54
<b>5Q1</b>	
<i>Ensemble</i>	365
<b>5Q10</b>	
1 4-6	599
<b>6Q6</b>	
<i>Ensemble</i>	351-371
<b>11Q5</b> ( <i>11QP<sup>s</sup>a</i> )	
<i>Ensemble</i>	607-626
XIX,15	38ss; 43
XXI-XXII	359ss
XXII,6 99	
XXVII,2-11	611ss
XXVII,3	616
<b>11Q10</b> ( <i>11Q<sup>tg</sup>Job</i> )	
XXXII,3	74
XXXV,9	73
XXXVI,2	51
XXXVIII,9	73
<b>11Q13</b> ( <i>11Q<sup>melch</sup></i> )	
II,12	17
<b>11Q17</b>	
IV,6	102
IX,7	102
<b>11Q19</b> ( <i>11Q<sup>temple</sup>a</i> ; <i>Rouleau du Temple</i> )	
XV,5	298
XV,11	31
XV,18	99
XVI,16	289
XIX,11-XXI,10	298
XX,9	289
XX,14	31
XXI,12-XXIII,1	298
XXIX,7-10	286

XXXIX,10	286
XLIII,3-4	298
XLIII,3.8-9	298
XLIII,9-10	298
XLIV,18	127
XLV,5	99
XLV,10	105
XLV,12-14	146
XLVI,13	360
XLVI,13-16	106
XLVII,13	451
XLVII,14-15	99
XLVIII,7-8	450
XLVIII,16	105
XLIX,8	101
XLIX,14	99
L,7	99
L,11	103
L,18	98
LI,14	103
LII,12-13	445
LII,13-LIII,10	194
LVI,1-11	93
LVII,7	123
LVII,11	123
LX,4	31
LX,21	617
LXVI	526

<b>11Q20</b>	
I,18	31

**Références aux Apocryphes et autres écrits**

<i>1 Hénoch</i>	
1,1-6	629
2,1-5-6	632
6,7	392
6-11	382; 389ss
7,1	382; 383; 386; 389
8,3	380; 382ss; 386; 392
8-11	394
9	642
9,8	395
10,4-5	395
10,4-8	230
10,16-21	230
12-16	395
13,10	356
14,8	384; 391

14,11	392	5,17-18	268
14,17	392	5,18	239
40,7	44	5,22	239
45,3	591	5,30-31	235
53,3	44	6,1	242; 246
65,6	44	6,4	241
69,16-25	285	6,7	242
81,1-6	434	6,9-16	242ss
82,1-2	434	6,10-14	262
82,1-4	577	6,12	260
90,28-29	286	6,15-16	242
93,1-2	577	6,15-19	244
93,4	648	6,17-22	262; 268
94,8	563	6,20-22	247
102,7	648	6,23	260
104,12-13	434	6,23-38	262
		6,32	261
<i>3 Hénoch</i>		6,33	260
23,18	356	6,36-37	245; 267
		6,37	260; 261
<i>Jubilés</i>		7,1-6	223; 266
1,4-5	259	7,20	230
1,15-17	286	7,23-24	241
1,26	259	7,27-28	241
1,29	259	7,30-31	241
2,9	263	7,32	241
2,17-23	224	7,33	241
2,17-24	261	7,35-36	266
2,20	223	8,19	223
2,24-33	225; 262	10,7-14	45
2,29-30	225; 269	10,8	220
2,32-33	260	11,11	220
3,8-15	226s	11,2	241
3,9-14	262	11,5	220; 241
3,14	260	13,8	234
3,15	572	13,25-27	263
3,26-31	228ss	14,1	234
3,29-31	262	14,20	247; 263
4,4	262	15,1-2	246; 247
4,5-6	262	15,12-14	248ss
4,18-19	396	15,15-24	249ss
4,23-24	396	15,25-34	263
4,26	223	15,33-16,1	249ss
4,31-32	262	16,1	234
5,6	230	16,3	263
5,10	230	16,9	263
5,13-18	231s	16,12	237
5,13-19	262	16,13-19	236
5,17	233	16,18	222

16,20-24	240	35,14	57
16,20-27	237ss	36	423
16,28	260	40,9	45ss
16,28-17,1	239	41,1-21	217
16,28-31	263	41,2-5	265
16,29-31	268	41,23-26	265
17,15-18,16	46	41,27	265
17,15-18,17	233ss	41,27-28	217; 265
17,17-18	263s	45,16	434
18,9	220	46,2	45ss
18,12	220	48	217ss
18,17-19,1	235	48,5-12	254
18,18	239	49	217ss
18,18-19	263	49,2	255s; 268
19,8-9	268	49,2-6	254
21,1	528	49,2-17	265
21,6	241	49,7-8	254
21,7	241	49,8	239
21,10	528	49,9	254
21,18	241	49,10-12	269
21,19	241	49,10-17	255
22,1	248	49,15	239
23,23	241	49,18	254
23,29	45ss	49,18-21	235
23,32	260; 264	49,22	239
24,22	234	49,22-23	257; 265
24,33	264	49,25	260
27,19	234	50,5	45ss
28,6-7	264		
28,11-24	234	<b>Testament des Douze P</b>	
30,6-7	251		
30,7-16	251s	<i>Testament de Reuben</i>	
30,8	223	1,1,2	538; 540s
30,8-17	264	1,5	528; 546
30,10	268	7,1	528
30,17	260		
30,19	260	<i>Testament de Simeon</i>	
30,18-23	264	1,1,2	538; 540s
31,14	264; 592; 596	6,2	356
31,15	594	8,1	528
31,31-32	264		
31,32	260	<i>Testament de Lévi</i>	
32,1	264	1,1,2	538; 540s
32,9-15	264	2,9	547
32,14	264	2,10	47
32,27-29	265	2,11	547
33,9	265	3,1	547
33,10-20	265	5,1	547
34,12-15	232s	6,8	547

8,1	547
9,2	547
9,3	547
10,1-5	528
11,3	547
19,4	528; 532; 541

*Testament de Judah*

1,1.2	538; 540ss
26,2	541
26,4	528

*Testament de Issachar*

1,1.2	538; 540ss
7,1	541
7,8	528

*Testament de Dan*

1,1.2	538; 540ss
3,6	47
5,6	47

*Testament de Naphtali*

1,1.2	538; 540ss
-------	------------

*Testament de Gad*

1,1.2	538; 540ss
-------	------------

*Testament de Aser*

1,1.2	538; 540ss
8,1	528

*Testament de Joseph*

1,1.2	538; 540ss
-------	------------

*Testament de Benjamin*

1,1.2	538; 540ss
12,1	528

*Testament de Moïse*

8,3	250
-----	-----

*Testament d'Abraham*

17,12-16	427
----------	-----

*Testament de Job*

4,4	47
6,4	47
6,12	47
7,1	47
16,2	47

*Testament de Salomon*

3,5	356
22,1	356
26,1-2	356

*4 Esdras*

4,37	356
------	-----

**Références à Philon d'Alexandrie***De Vita Contemplativa*

30-31	292
67	296

*Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit*

9,18	356
------	-----

*Hypothetica*

11,14	356
-------	-----

**Références à Flavius Josèphe***Guerre des Juifs (BJ)*

II,120	356
II,121	357
II,128	298
II,130	185
II,130	296
II,132	296
II,147-149	106
II,160-161	357
II,318	534

*Antiquités Judaïques (Ant)*

XII,129-153	582
XII,241	250
XVIII,19	286

**Littérature targumique***Tg Neophyti*

Gen 20,2.3	393
Gen 34,15	417ss
Gen 34,22	417ss
Gen 34,23	417ss

*Ps Jonathan*

Ex 20,2.3	393
Lev 18,21	252

**Littérature rabbinique**

		<i>Tosefta</i>	
		2,18	409
<i>Bérakhot</i>		<i>Bavli</i>	
<i>Mishnah</i>		25a	268
6,6	294s	28b	409
8,6	410		
<i>Tosefta</i>		<i>Haguiga</i>	
4,8	294; 295	<i>Bavli</i>	
<i>Bavli</i>		13a	130
53b	410		
<i>Yerushalmi</i>		<i>Ketouvot</i>	
6c	411	<i>Mishnah</i>	
		1,5	446s
<i>Érouvin</i>		5,8	240
<i>Yerushalmi</i>		<i>Tosefta</i>	
22b	410	2,2	120
		<i>Bavli</i>	
<i>Péssahim</i>		12a	447
<i>Mishnah</i>			
5,3	256; 269	<i>Sota</i>	
7,9	256	<i>Bavli</i>	
7,12	256	23b	451
<i>Bavli</i>			
49a	443	<i>Guitine</i>	
<i>Yerushalmi</i>		<i>Bavli</i>	
7,11	106	44a	122
<i>Šekalim</i>			
<i>Mishnah</i>		<i>Baba Kama</i>	
7,7	410	<i>Bavli</i>	
<i>Tosefta</i>		27b	122
3,4	410		
		<i>Baba Metsi'a</i>	
<i>Bétsa</i>		<i>Mishnah</i>	
<i>Mishnah</i>		4,10	118
1,10	411	<i>Tosefta</i>	
<i>Bavli</i>		1,8	118
5a	122	3,25	118
<i>Roš Hašana</i>		<i>Sanhédrine</i>	
<i>Mishnah</i>		<i>Mishnah</i>	
1	267	1,1	121
1,2	239	2,1	295
2	267	2,3	295
		2,4	295
<i>Taanit</i>		4,1	121; 454
<i>Yerushalmi</i>		<i>Tosefta</i>	
64c	411	8,7	410
		12,3	120
<i>Méguila</i>		<i>Bavli</i>	
<i>Mishnah</i>		21a	410
4,9	252; 268		



*Yerushalmi*  
20c 410  
21c 122

*Makot*  
*Mishnah*  
3,3 269  
6,7 106

*Ševou'ot*  
*Mishnah*  
8,13 118  
*Yerushalmi*  
7d 411

*Édouyot*  
*Mishnah*  
2.2 410

*Avot*  
*Mishnah*  
5,3 268

*Zévaïm*  
*Mishnah*  
11,4-5 194  
11,7 194  
12,4 410  
*Bavli*  
104a 410

*Ména'hot*  
*Bavli*  
21b 410

*Tamid*  
*Mishnah*  
6,4-7,3 593  
*Bavli*  
31b 122

*Mikvaot*  
*Tosefta*  
7,8 106

*Yadayim*  
*Mishnah*  
3,5 352

*Tosefta*  
2,14 352

*Gen Rabbah*  
2,9 410  
3,6 410  
19 48

*Nm Rabbah*  
20,15 13  
*Lev Rabbah*  
2,9 410

*Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*  
5 256

*Sifre Dt*  
160 410

### Autres textes

Platon  
*Phèdre*  
99d 394  
229b 296

Xénophon  
*Cyropédie*  
VIII,4.2 296

Cicéron  
*Pro Flacco*  
15-17 294

Pline l'Ancien  
*Histoire naturelle*  
V,73 202; 356

Aulu-Gelle  
*Nuits attiques*  
VII.1.2,4 575

Eusèbe de Césarée  
*Préparation évangélique*  
IX.21.16 534ss